November 14, 2007

Board of Trustees
El Camino Community
College District

Dear Members of the Board:

Welcome to your Board packet for the Board meeting of Monday, November 19, 2007. With temperatures in the 80’s, in southern California, it hardly feels it is nearly Thanksgiving week. I trust you, your family and friends, will enjoy this wonderful unique American holiday.

The agenda for the work to be done on Monday, November 19, is highlighted by the consent agenda which features the following items:

A. Academic Affairs

1. Board Policy 4231-Grade Change. You will note that this is the first reading of the policy. The procedure, which may undergo significant changes, is also attached for your information.

2. An exciting winter study abroad program in Ghana.

3. A number of curriculum changes and the beginning of a list of revisions to our certificates which were formerly Certificates of Competence and Completion and will now be Certificates of Achievement.

B. Student Services

1. A number of student field trips.

2. The travel request for the El Camino College Choir was submitted late, however, we verified insurance coverage prior to the event.

3. The El Camino College 2008-09 School Year Calendar which may see some amendments to the Compton Educational Center Summer School schedule.

C. Administrative Services

1. Routine business and administrative actions are recommended for your approval.
2. Item J, Page 38, restates the financial presentation of the Facilities Master Plan which you adopted at the last Board meeting.

D. Measure E

1. Recommendation authorizes contract with LPA, Inc., for architectural services to design and construct the Mathematics and Business building. LPA did a fine job with our soon-to-be completed Humanities Building. The contract amount is roughly 8% of the projected project cost and does not increase if the project cost increases due to inflation.

2. Eight change orders are recommended for your approval for the Humanities Building.

E. Human Resources recommend a number of routine personnel actions and the development of two new classified positions.

F. The Superintendent/President’s section recommends the second reading and adoption of Board Policy 2510-Participation in Local Decision Making. The recommendation and presentation are the same as that for the October meeting and provides the students their legal right to participate in collegial consultation.

G. Committee of the Whole

The 2006-2007 Board of Trustees Evaluation and Goals for 2007-2008 is set in a Committee of the Whole environment to permit you to discuss both last year’s performance and to develop goals for adoption at the December 17, 2007, Board meeting. Materials sent to you on October 24, 2007, are enclosed for your review.

H. Closed Session will include collective bargaining and a potential litigation issue.

Your Board packet also includes Dr. Arce’s response to Academic Senate on two of the Senate’s recent resolutions. The new year is fast approaching and we should commit to the Community College League of California (CCLC) if any of you would like to attend the New Trustee Conference and Legislative Conference in Sacramento on January 26-28, 2009.

You may have received information from the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) on the 2008 Summit in Washington, D.C. A couple of you have previously attended the Summit. Provost Givens and I may visit the Department of Education on a financial aid matter during the Summit. The following materials are presented for your perusal:

2. Agenda for the November 15, 2007, California Community College Trustees meeting;

3. President’s Newsletters of October 19, and November 2, 2007;

4. El Camino College Community News, Fall 2007;

5. Update on Federal Issues from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, November 2007;


7. “Dan Walters: Governor’s Desertion Haunts Him,” Sacramento Bee, November 9, 2007;


10.“Governor Vetoes Bill on School Governance,” SFGate.com, October 14, 2007;

11.“Peter Schrag: California School Fixes Ahead: Proceed With Caution,” Sacramento Bee, October 31, 2007;

12.“Undocumented Kids Seek Aid of Congress,” Sacramento Bee, October 16, 2007;

13.“Peter Schrag: Educate Them, Then Deport Them: This is Nuts,” Sacramento Bee, October 24, 2007;

14.“Fractured California May Not Be Governable,” Los Angeles Times, October 22, 2007;

15.“Opportunities in Compton,” Press telegram.com, October 29, 2007;

16.“LAUSD Sets Schedule of Fees for Use of Its Facilities,” Daily Breeze, November 5, 2007;
17. “Improve Your Ability to Handle...,” *The Greentree Gazette*, October 25, 2007;


25. “Knowledge for Rent,” *Orange County Register*, October 14, 2007;


27. “LBCC to Put $440M Bond on February Ballot,” *Press Telegram*, November 7, 2007;


33. “DVC Tries to Protect Image Abroad,” *Contra Costa Times*, October 31, 2007;

34. “Some Community College Students Fall Through the Cracks in Their First Month,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 16, 2007;

35. “Professor Uses Performance to Hook Students on Astronomy,” *SFGate.com*, November 1, 2007;


37. “Getting Students Through Remedial Math Is A Constant Struggle, But This College Keeps Trying,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 26, 2007;


40. “Professor Makes a Case for Faculty-Student Romance,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 22, 2007;


42. “CSU Students Not Ready to Make Nice—And They Don’t Have To,” *SFGate.com*, November 8, 2007;


44. “Miami Dade Evaluates Courses for 10 Key Skills,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 2, 2007;


46. “Achievement Gap for Minorities Must be Eliminated,” *Fresno Bee*, October 21, 2007;

48. “Peter Schrag: UC Admissions: Slouching Toward Affirmative Action?”
Sacramento Bee, November 7, 2007;

49. “UC Panel Urges Eligibility Change to Cut Guarantee Admissions,” SFGate,
November 1, 2007;

50. “UC, CSU Fees Up More than U.S. Average, Way Over Inflation Rate,”
October 23, 2007;

51. “Community College Funding Measure Isn’t Popular at UC, CSU,” SFGate.com,
November 12, 2007;

52. “Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and Latino Community Again
Disappointed by the Governor’s Veto of the California Dream Act,” October 15,
2007;

53. California Teacher, September-October 2007;

54. AFT Perspective, October 2007.

I look forward to meeting with you on Monday, November 19, 2007, and will be
available in my office at 3:30 p.m. In the meantime, please phone Kathy or me if you
have any questions, comments or concerns.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President

TMF/kao
Cc: Vice Presidents, Director of Community Relations
Dear Pete,

I am writing in response to the Senate Resolution Regarding Construction of Counselors’ Offices in the New Student Services Building. While it is practical to involve the users in facilities design, facilities do not fall into the 10 plus 1 areas of consultation. Regardless, decisions about facilities are not made in isolation and contrarily, there is a great deal of participation in facilities planning and design. The Student Services Building cost increases necessitated value engineering the design. As you are aware the projected cost escalated from $32 to more than $52 million dollars affecting other bond projects feasibility. Other aspects of the building were downsized as well as the counselor private offices.

The counselors’ concerns regarding privacy and confidentiality were taken into consideration and a showroom tour was conducted on June 14, 2007 to learn about alternatives to private offices. A total of four showrooms were visited by approximately 10 counselors and managers to learn about possible office configurations using modular walls. In addition, a sound-masking system call “Confidante” was demonstrated. According to the showroom vendors, the carpeting and ceiling structure as well as the construction of the panels will determine the amount of sound dampening within an open office configuration. Literature and research studies were provided by Steelcase to support the notion of privacy of speech within an open office environment. Steelcase is also willing to set up a modular office with Confidante within the Student Services Building so that counselors can test out the sound-dampening possibilities of the system.

No further action has been taken to bring in the modular test office since the Student Services Building project will be delayed for about four to five years.

Regards

Francisco M. Arce

c: Thomas M. Fallo
   Jeanie Nishime
October 23, 2007

Dear Pete,

Since receiving the Senate Resolution for Standardized Technology in the Classrooms I forwarded it to John Wagstaff for consideration and discussion in the Technology Committee. Currently, there are:

- 67 classrooms at Level 1 - Video Projection only with hook-up for computer,
- 22 classrooms at Level 2 - Projector w/ Computer and VCR or DVD player - w/ speakers,
- 74 classrooms at Level 3 - Full Smart control console w/ complete AV package.

The college has over 320 classrooms for lecture, laboratory and activities and while having a standard across the board may seem logical, it may not be practical as classroom use is largely determined by the type of instruction held in it. The Technology Committee with involvement from the Academic Divisions should recommend the most economically feasible Technology Plan for deploying classroom technology according to instructional need.

With regard to the Compton Center, ECC and the Compton District are in the first stage of development of the Compton Education Center Master Plan. The Master Plan once completed will determine the instructional facilities needs and basis for the Facilities Plan. Included in the planning will be the installation of instructional technology systems.

Regards

Francisco M. Arce
Vice President of Academic Affairs

c:  Tomas M. Fallo, President
    John Wagstaff, Director of Information Technology
    Jeffrey Marsee, Vice President
October 24, 2007

Mr. William Beverly
3424 Carson Street
Torrance, CA  90503

Dear Bill:

During the October 15th Board meeting discussion of Board goals, you requested examples of previous El Camino Community College District Board Goals and a quick review of some other districts’ Board goals. Please find the enclosed:

1. 2004-2005 Board Goals;
2. 2005-2006 Board Goals;
3. 2007-2009 Long Beach Community College District Board Goals;
4. City College of San Francisco Vision Statement;

Thank you for submitting your evaluation forms. A summary of responses will be placed on the November Board agenda for discussion and development of past and future Board goals.

The fires in California have severely disrupted many campuses. Approximately 12 campuses were closed Monday and Tuesday of this week and many community college colleagues have suffered significant losses. Athletic and academic competitions have been cancelled or rescheduled. At this time, I am not aware of any El Camino College colleagues suffering personal or property losses. We continue to hope for any early return to a safe, normal educational environment.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns on the attached, please feel free to contact Kathy or me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas M. Fallo
Superintendent/President

TMF/kao
Cc: Vice Presidents, Director of Community Relations
EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Agenda for the El Camino Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting

A. 2004-2005 Board of Trustee Goals and Evaluation

Each year the Board of Trustees establishes goals and evaluates its performance on the previous year’s goals. The Board of Trustees’ remarks are publicly presented and members of the Board may discuss, amend or delete the recommended goals for the forthcoming year.

I. New Trustee Orientation
   A. Consider assigning or referring a mentor.
   B. Help new Trustee strengthen links to external community.
   C. Encourage new Trustee to seek Trustee educational opportunities.
   D. Encourage CEO availability to new Trustee.

II. Effect implementation of the November 5, 2002 Measure E successful bond election.

   A. Update College Facilities Master Plan.
   B. Implement construction program.
   C. Monitor and approve construction program.

III. Participate in community activities and events and bring observations to the Board for policy issues.

   A. Attend events in the community.
   B. Speak to community groups.
   C. Make Board presentations.
   D. Bring copies of community events and activities to other Board members.

IV. Participate in the operation of the College at Board Meetings.

   A. Speak freely and openly on policy issues.
   B. Solicit opinions of fellow Board members.
   C. Present ideas during discussion section of Board Meetings.

V. Continue a Trustee education program.

   A. Attend a conference on Trustee responsibilities.
   B. Submit materials from various sources to fellow Trustees.
   C. Read Trustee education materials send by various organizations.

January 23, 2006

President and Board of Trustees
B. 2005-2006 Board of Trustee Goals and Evaluation

Each year the Board of Trustees establishes goals and evaluates its performance on the previous year’s goals. The Board of Trustees’ remarks are publicly presented and members of the Board may discuss, amend or delete the recommended goals for the forthcoming year.

I. New Trustees Orientation
   A. Consider assigning or referring a mentor.
   B. Help new Trustees strengthen links to external community.
   C. Encourage new Trustees to seek Trustee educational opportunities.
   D. Encourage CEO availability to new Trustees.

II. Effect implementation of the November 5, 2002 Measure E bond election.
   A. Continue updating College Facilities Master Plan.
   B. Implement construction program.
   C. Monitor and approve construction program.

III. Participate in community activities and events and bring observations to the Board for policy issues.
   A. Attend events in the community.
   B. Speak to community groups.
   C. Make Board presentations.
   D. Bring copies of community events and activities to other Board members.

IV. Participate in the operation of the College at Board Meetings.
   A. Speak freely and openly on policy issues.
   B. Solicit opinions of fellow Board members.
   C. Present ideas during discussion section of Board Meetings.

V. Continue a Trustee education program.
   A. Attend a conference on Trustee responsibilities.
   B. Submit materials from various sources to fellow Trustees.
   C. Read Trustee education materials send by various organizations.

January 23, 2006

President and Board of Trustees
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees and the LBCCD Community

FROM: Douglas W. Otto and Eloy O. Oakley

RE: Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009

DATE: May 8, 2007

The attached Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009 are an outgrowth of the Board of Trustees’ retreat on March 23 and 24, 2007, and subsequent comments by and conversations with all Board of Trustees members and various members of the LBCCD administration and staff. Superintendent-President Oakley and I have worked hard over many hours to develop these goals to guide the Board of Trustees through the next two academic years. These goals reflect a commitment to transparency and accountability, and send a message that the identified goals are important to the Board of Trustees to ensure the success of the LBCCD.

The goals are organized under three subheadings:

1. MEASURE AND IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS
2. MEASURE AND IMPROVE FISCAL INFRASTRUCTURE STABILITY
3. IMPROVE ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTION AND CREATE A GREATER SENSE OF COMMUNITY

A number of specific goals are then set forth under each of these subheadings. Each sets forth an individual goal with timelines, performance measures, and deadlines by which progress towards the goal should be assessed. The goals in their entirety set forth the workload for the Board of Trustees over the next two academic years.

Thank you for your work and insight in bringing this newly articulated direction to the LBCCD.
BOARD OF TRUSTEES GOALS
2007–2009

1. MEASURE AND IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS

A. Ensure that a college readiness (basic skills) program with timelines and performance measures is presented by Fall 2007, and monitor the program bi-annually
B. Monitor implementation strategies and their results to improve LBCCD’s standing on the ARCC student success measurements including results by ethnicity bi-annually
C. Review a report with an action plan that assess the effectiveness of student support services and its relationship to the LBCCD mission by Spring 2008
D. Review progress on the LBCCD’s Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, including timelines and measurement criteria annually, concurrent with the Annual Accreditation Report in the Spring semester
E. Review a report on LBCCD’s transfer success programs such as the Honor’s Program to ensure that the needs of transfer oriented students are being met by Spring 2008
F. Review a report by Fall 2007 on the effectiveness of LBCCD Career Technical Education programs with an action plan and timeline to increase their effectiveness and alignment with the workforce needs of the region

2. MEASURE AND IMPROVE FISCAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE STABILITY

A. Adopt Board budget guidelines that include:
   - a balanced General Fund budget
   - a 5.0% General Fund reserve
   - a sound reserve for retiree benefits
   - a sound reserve for increased facilities maintenance
   - a sound reserve for technology replacement and support
B. Review technology plans with timelines and budgets for:
   - administrative support
   - instructional and student support services
C. Adopt a revised Facilities Master Plan and assess the need for, and if necessary, adopt a General Obligation Bond Extension Plan
D. Continue to monitor progress toward goals of the Enrollment Management Program, including:
   - enrollment goals
   - recruitment and retention
   - marketing and branding
   - scheduling and curriculum alignment
   - a review of the matriculation process and identification of institutional barriers to matriculation
3. **IMPROVE ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTION AND CREATE A GREATER SENSE OF COMMUNITY**

   A. Review a revised Administrative Organizational Chart by July 31, 2007
   B. Hire VP of Academic Affairs and VP of Administrative Services by September 1, 2007
   C. Review a professional development plan for all faculty and staff with funding strategies and implementation timeline by December 31, 2007
   D. Support the development of a streamlined decision-making and governance structure by Fall 2008
   E. Require and review a diversity plan with the goal of improving the proportional ethnic and gender representation of faculty and staff relative to the proportions in the LBCCD community with timelines and annual benchmarks by Spring 2008
   F. Ensure opportunities for all stakeholders to participate in accreditation self-study and approve a plan for addressing recommendations of the visiting team no later than three-months after the accrediting commission issues its final report and recommendations
   G. Support the development of student leadership by requiring and reviewing an annual ASB Strategic Plan
   H. Develop a plan by August 1, 2007 that expands and enhances opportunities for the Board of Trustees to raise the profile of the LBCCD in the broader community
   I. Communicate and operate with an appropriate consciousness of student interest
Our Vision

As the City College of San Francisco moves into the twenty-first century, our foremost vision is that we will continue to value and foster superior levels of educational participation and academic success among our students. Through the outreach to and inclusion of all populations, the provision of an unparalleled learning experience for students, and the enhancement of a supporting and caring environment that sustains and leads them to the successful completion of their educational goals, we are motivated by a compelling and authentic vision.

A Teaching and Learning Community

Above all else, we aspire to be a teaching and learning community whose principal distinction is the quality of instruction delivered by departments with strong reputations in their fields. The quality of success in learning will permeate all levels of the educational experience, from basic skills to advanced honors courses, from vocational/technical to the academic courses, from citizenship preparation and adult retraining to university transfer courses. The breadth of superior learning opportunities extends to a vast array of courses and programs sufficient to offer any student a pathway to educational and career success.

A Service Community

We will continue to reach out to all neighborhoods, ethnic populations, and economic segments of our service area; develop campuses and sites to better serve geographic areas of the city; diversify and improve programs and services for the benefit of the community; build partnerships with public, private, and community-based agencies to better respond to educational, economic and societal needs; and foster informed participation of our students and employees in community life.

A Diverse and Caring Community

We seek to build an inclusive community, where respect and trust are common virtues, and where all people are enriched by diversity and multi-cultural understanding; a responsive environment in which student needs are met in a friendly, caring, and timely manner; and a working environment for all faculty, staff and administrators in which everyone is valued and the climate is supportive, positive, and productive.

A Contributing Community

In the larger realms of the state, the nation and the world, we hope to share our educational resources and contribute knowledge, expertise, and innovation as a post secondary institution of higher education, as members of the community colleges of the state of California and throughout the country, as colleagues in our various fields, trades, and professions, and as educators committed to lifelong educational opportunities for all.
Mission Statement

CCSF provides educational programs and services to meet the following needs of our diverse community:

- Preparation for transfer to baccalaureate institutions
- Achievement of Associate Degrees of Arts and Science
- Acquisition of career skills needed for success in the workplace
- Active engagement in the civic and social fabric of the community, citizenship preparation, and English as a Second Language
- Completion of requirements for the Adult High School Diploma and GED
- Promotion of economic development and job growth
- Lifelong learning, life skills, and cultural enrichment

To enhance student learning and maintain a commitment to excellence, the college provides an array of academic and student services that support the development of students' intellectual, cultural, and civic achievements. City College of San Francisco belongs to the community and continually strives to reaffirm its commitment as a resource for the community.
INTRODUCTION
(General Information)

THE COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT MISSION STATEMENT

MISSION

The primary mission of the Coast Community College District (CCCD) is to provide quality lower-division and occupational education to ensure that students from all ages and from all socio-economic backgrounds have the opportunity to achieve their postsecondary educational goals. Inherent in this mission is the provision of transitional instruction and those support services that promote student success. In addition, the District will offer non-credit courses and other community service programs that will meet cultural, recreational, professional in-service, and personal development needs.

GOALS

Goal 1: Provide the highest quality lower-division transfer education.

Goal 2: Provide the highest quality occupational education training and retraining that meets community and student needs.

Goal 3: Provide the highest quality transitional and life-long education programs that meet community needs.

Goal 4: Provide a self-supporting community services program that meets cultural, recreational, professional in-service, and personal development needs of the community.

Goal 5: Support the economic growth and development of the communities served by the Coast District by making the resources of the district and its colleges available to local businesses, industry, and government.

Goal 6: Provide learning resources and student support services needed to promote student success and to measure that success.

Goal 7: Establish articulation plans among the three campuses, the local high schools, and the colleges and universities.

Goal 8: Develop, implement, and maintain programs that address international and intercultural education.
INTRODUCTION
(General Information)

Goal 9:  Maintain an energetic, involved, and informed faculty, classified staff, and administration through staff development, training, and other programs and initiatives.

Goal 10: Increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and administrative personnel so that the district's employees reflect the diversity of California's population.

Goal 11: Maintain and update one-year and five-year improvement plans on an annual cycle, and ten-year and twenty-year master improvement plans on a five-year cycle. The plans will include these elements: instruction, support services, human resources, facilities, and other capital expenditures.
Effective Trusteeship Workshop

January 25–27, 2008
Sheraton Grand, Sacramento

Registration brochure is mailed and posted to the Web site in late November.

Trustees are most effective when they have comprehensive knowledge and excellent governing skills. The Effective Trusteeship Workshop is the single overview of the responsibilities of California's community college trustees. Selected leaders and experienced trustees will provide substantive information and ample opportunity to discuss questions.

All recently elected and appointed trustees should attend the Trustee Workshop. Continuing trustees, student trustees, and CEOs are also very welcome, and will gain much from the workshop.

Board presidents and vice presidents may wish to attend part of the Effective Trusteeship Workshop with their new trustees and then participate in the Chair Workshop.

The 2008 Trustee Handbook will be released at the workshop. Additional resources provided include the Ethics Laws Reference and Open and Public III (Brown Act publication), along with other important resources.

For more information, contact the League at ccic@ccleague.org.
Advocating for Opportunity
Building Bridges to Success

2008 LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE
January 27–28
Sheraton Grand Sacramento Hotel

With Proposition 92 - the Community College Initiative - on the February election ballot, 2008 will be a pivotal year for community colleges. The legislative conference will provide a unique opportunity to connect with other advocates working for affordable and accessible higher education.

At the conference, participants will learn the latest information about Prop 92 in the big last week push of the campaign, as well as initiatives proposed by the Governor, legislative proposals affecting community colleges and students, state budget developments, advocacy strategies for the coming year and more.

Join your community college colleagues in the launch of this exciting legislative year as we advocate for opportunity and help build bridges to success!

For registration and hotel information, visit
www.ccleague.org

Or contact the League's Governmental Relations office at
(916) 441-0353 · legoffice@ccleague.org
Advocate

Return to Advocacy > National Legislative Summit

2008 Summit at a Glance and Special Meetings

Sunday, February 10

- 3 p.m. – 8 p.m. Registration
- 5 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Pre-NLS Session

Monday, February 11

- 7 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. Registration
- 8 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. Opening General Sessions
- 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Roundtable Seminar for Community College Lawyers
- 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. Community College Priorities Session
- 12:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. General Session Luncheon with Charlie Cook and Stuart Rothenberg*
- 2:30 p.m. – 4 p.m. Policy Focus Sessions
- 5:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. National Capital Reception

Tuesday, February 12

- 7 a.m. – 2:30 p.m. Registration
- 7 a.m. – 8:15 a.m. State Breakfast Meetings (at hotel)
- 8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. General Sessions
- Noon – 2 p.m. Taste of DC (lunch on your own)
- Afternoon Visits to House, Senate, and Executive Branch Offices
- 7 p.m. – 9 p.m. Capital Awards and Entertainment Banquet*

Wednesday, February 13

- 8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. General Session Breakfast*
- Morning Visits to House, Senate and Executive Branch Offices
- Afternoon Additional visits to House, Senate and Executive Branch Offices

*Tickets Required

Saturday, February 9**

ACCT Board Committees
- Diversity
- Finance & Audit
- Governance & Bylaws
- Member Communications & Education
- Public Policy


10/16/2007
Sunday, February 10**
ACCT Board of Directors
AACC/ACCT Joint
Commission on Federal Relations
ACCT Regional Nominating Committees
ACCT Regional and State Network
ACCT Trust Fund Board

Tuesday, February 12
ACCT Advisory Committee of Presidents
ACCT Corporate Council

**Please note that the start of these meetings is prior to the official start of the NLS program.

All meetings take place at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel unless otherwise noted.

Meeting times/sessions are subject to change.

ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE

1233 20th Street, N
Suite 3C
Washington, DC 2003
(Phone) 202.775.46
(Fax) 202.223.125
CCCT BOARD
AGENDA
November 15, 2007 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
San Jose Fairmont, Atherton Room
San Jose, CA
(Lunch will be served at Noon)

1. Opening
   President Rebecca Garcia will call the meeting to order.
   10:00-10:15

   • 1.1 Minutes (Action)
      Action will be taken on the September 14 – 15, 2007 meeting minutes.

   • 1.2 President’s Report (Information)

   • 1.3 President and Chief Executive Officer’s Report (Information)
      The board will receive the League’s first quarter fiscal report.

2. Legislation and Finance
   10:15-10:30

   • 2.1 Statewide Fiscal Update (Discussion)
      The board will receive the latest information about issues related to the 2008-09 System Budget request.

   • 2.2 End of Year Legislative Report (Information)
      The board will receive a report on action taken by the Governor on bills of interest to California community colleges.

   • 2.3 Proposition 92 – The Community College Initiative (Discussion)
      The board will receive a report on the campaign to achieve passage of Proposition 92, the fundraising necessary to support that goal and discuss ways the CCCT board can help develop (develop a plan of action?) local trustee support for the proposition.

   • 2.4 Legislator of the Year Award (Discussion/Action)
      The board will consider and act on names forwarded by the CCCT Executive Committee from those submitted by local trustees and League staff and which meet the board’s established criteria to be the recipients of the 2008 CCCT Legislator of the year award.

   • 2.5 Election Results (Information/Discussion)
      The board will receive information about the November 6 election, including the results of the local trustees’ elections, and implications for community colleges.

      A working, buffet lunch will be made available for the board
      12:00
2.6 Community College Funding (Information) 12:15-12:30

The board will receive information on the various community college funding streams, including areas such as credit, noncredit and for credit, and the impact on the colleges, districts and System.

3. Education Issues

3.1 Consultation Task Force on Assessment’s Recommendations (Information) 12:30-12:45

The board will receive a report on the Board of Governors response to the Consultation Task Force on Assessment’s recommendations (completed in October 2007 and presented to the BOG in November).

3.2 Invest In Success Report (Information) 12:45-1:00

The board will receive the executive summary of California State University’s Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy report, “Invest in Success: How Finance Policy can Increase Student Success at California’s Community Colleges.

Note:

- Information items are those presented for information only and questions from board members
- Discussion items are presented so as to receive comments and direction from board members while issue resolution is in its formative stages
- Discussion/Action items are those where discussion may lead to action taken at the meeting
- Action items require a vote of the board
- Support material in agenda
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
CCCCT BOARD
September 14-15, 2007
Sacramento Hyatt Regency

1. Opening

The meeting was called to order by President Rebecca Garcia at 7:02 p.m. Other members present were: Kay Albani, Rosanne Bader, Isabel Barreras, Carolyn Batiste, Judi Beck, Tom Clark, Mary Figueroa, Paul Fong, Anita Grier, Chuck Hayden, Reginald James, Jeanette Mann, Charles Meng, Georgia Mercer, Ed Ortell, Andre Quintero, Maria Elena Serna, Don Singer and Luis Villegas. Others present were: Andrew Acosta, Jody Ansell, Scott Lay, Rita Mize, Bonnie Slosson, Cindra Smith and Theresa Tena.

In accordance with CCCT Governing Policy I.1. Absences of Members, Rebecca said that Walt Howald was absent for the second time. The Executive Committee felt that, because both of Walt’s absences was due to college business, he should be considered excused.

1.1 Minutes

On motion by Isabel Barreras, the board adopted the minutes of the June 22-23, 2007 meeting as amended to include the new League staff members’ names. Georgia Mercer and Reginald James abstained.

1.2 President’s Report

Rebecca welcomed new student trustee member Reginald James and administered the CCCT Oath of Office.

She reported that she attended the July 9 Board of Governors (BOG) meeting and that Cabrillo College received a diversity and equity award for the third time. She encouraged trustee attendance at BOG meetings and being prepared to speak to key issues. At the July 13, 2007 League Board of Directors meeting, John Romo was elected Chair, Rebecca was elected First Vice Chair and Michael Viera was elected Second Vice Chair. On July 19, Rebecca attended Consultation Council, where assessment was discussed with the goal of better understanding which tools were being used to be sure uniform assessment was performed across the system in Math and English.

1.3 League President and CEO’s Report

League President/CEO Scott Lay said that statewide Academic Senate President Mark Lieu had been a great help on the Assessment Task Force. All the colleges had responded to the assessment survey and the system office staff had done an excellent job compiling and summarizing the data. At the most, six tests are used across the system to assess students’ math and English levels. The main issues will be transparency of data and finding a way to systematize how the scores are evaluated. Scott applauded the good work done by Anne McKinney and Bonnie Slosson on Tuition Sensitivity, which has now been successfully resolved. He visited Washington and Oregon with the EDGE Campaign to observe how community colleges and work force investment boards work together and discuss the issues with the leaders in those states.
Scott also attended a Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) meeting at which a Hewlett Foundation funded survey that will be conducted on attitudes toward higher education was discussed. All segments of higher education were present and provided input. Internal polling by UC and CSU indicates the public is concerned about the rising cost of higher education.

2. Legislation and Finance

2.1 Community College Initiative

Scott Lay said two regional fundraisers are being planned, one in Los Angeles on November 5 and one in San Francisco on November 14. Additionally, a reception highlighting the initiative will be held at the ACCT Congress, just prior to the dinner at which Rebecca Garcia will be honored as a regional award winner. Board members received the district fundraising request for the second phase of the campaign and the latest information on how much had already been collected. Twice as much must be raised in the second phase. Many districts that were not involved in the first phase have taken an active role in the second. $25,000 was recently received from the State Center Faculty PAC. California Teachers Association (CTA) is still split over the initiative, with the community college arm of the union supporting and the parent body opposed. The situation is still being watched closely, but CTA is not expected to spend funds opposing the initiative. As a precaution, staff prepared talking points were distributed to the members. California School Boards Association (CSBA) and the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) remain neutral. The proposition number for the initiative is expected to be received in October and campaign materials will then be produced and distributed.

Scott introduced Andrew Acosta, the consultant to the campaign for the initiative and he described the press events that were being held at local districts throughout the state to generate momentum. He provided information to each board member, including a list of endorsers, endorsement cards, schedule of press events, and information from the kick off press event held at San Joaquin Delta College.

Members discussed the critical importance of the initiative to the colleges’ future; the need for simple and relevant talking points; polling; slanting information to the specific audience (businesses will be influenced differently than students, for example); endorsements by local officials; and commended Andrew for the good work.

2.2 2007-08 State Budget

Director of State Fiscal Policy Theresa Tena noted changes to the state budget reserve of $4.1 billion were due to the $500 million payment the court ruled the state would have to pay the State Teachers Retirement fund (STRS). Also, the governor’s veto message on the $33.1 million for Basic Skills indicated there was room to negotiate those funds back into the budget and thanks to the efforts of Diane Woodruff, Erik Skinner, Patrick Perry, Phil Day and others, a compromise was achieved. AB 194 includes most of the System’s original Basic Skills Initiative, but the allocation mechanism is based on 50% Basic Skills FTES and 50% targeted to students transitioning from high school.

Despite the strong language used by the governor in his veto message on the enhanced noncredit augmentation, a meeting held after the release of the veto message has budget advocates cautiously optimistic the $13.8 million appropriation may come back to the System.
2.3 2008-09 System Budget Request

Theresa said the system’s budget request had been developed by the Chancellor’s Budget Task Force and was supported by Consultation Council. She said it complements the System Strategic Plan and the developing consensus among business leaders, policy makers and the public that a more educated California workforce is needed and important to the economic health of the state. She noted some minor increase in three items of the state budget request adopted by the Board of Governors on September 10: Maintaining Effectiveness of Student Services Categorical Programs at $7,628m; Transfer Initiative at $11m; and Student Senate at $300k; all of which raised the budget request by $3m to a total of $759,418m.

Members discussed COLA and Growth, the system’s priorities, and health insurance.

On a motion by Isabel Barreras, the board endorsed the 2008-09 System Budget Request adopted by the BOG on September 10, 2007.

2.4 State Legislation

Director of Governmental Relations Bonnie Slosson described the end of the legislative session, in which unusually high numbers of bills were subject to ‘gut and amend’ or were “held hostage.” She said the legislature is likely to be called into special session to deal with two issues, water and health care, but no dates had yet been set. A number of bills did proceed to the Governor’s desk and were awaiting his action.

Kay Albiani left the meeting.

Members discussed AB 1548 (textbooks) and whether they preferred a support position on that bill.

Tom Clark moved the board accept the staff-recommended positions. Reginald James offered an amendment that the board take a support position on AB 1548 rather than neutral. The amendment was not accepted as a friendly. The board voted on the amendment and acted to take a support position on AB 1548.

The board then acted on the original motion and approved the staff recommended positions on AB 1559 support, SB 1 support, and SB 139 support.

Kay Albiani returned to the meeting.

3. Education Policy

3.1 Advisory Committee on Education Process

Director of Education Services Cindra Smith provided information on the Advisory Committee on Education Services responsibilities, membership, accomplishments and process. She highlighted work done in areas emphasized by the League Strategic Plan, including CEO succession and development; evaluating the quality and effectiveness of trustee services such as the conferences; and she also gave a brief overview of ongoing work such as the publications that the committee is responsible for.
Members discussed committee selection; the timing of the trustee conference; how input is gathered; the policy role of the CCCT board, the excellent record of the League in responding to trustee suggestions and requests; conference evaluations and calls for proposals as tools for input; warned against trying to fix a process that is not flawed or broken; and suggested that board members make a strong commitment to contact local boards per the communication plan to pass on information about trustee opportunities and encourage participation.

Scott spoke about the structure of the League, the history of the CCCT and CEOCCC policy boards of the League and past and recent efforts to change the League structure. He also noted that League committee participation was one way to involve member districts not represented on the policy boards. He suggested the committee applications be posted to the website to help alert more people of the opportunity to serve.

The meeting recessed at 9:35 p.m.

**September 15, 2007 The meeting reconvened at 8:30 a.m.**

3.2 Community College Funding

Theresa Tena described League efforts to educate constituents about fiscal policy, including the Fiscal Policy Toolkit, written this year by Cindra Smith and which provides a comprehensive overview of community college budgets. The document is in its last editing stages and publication is anticipated this year.

Additionally, now that the League website has been upgraded and has new capacities, Theresa and Jody Ansell are working to create an online budget basics tool that can be used for both educational and advocacy purposes. While still in the early stages of development, the idea is to describe the state budget process, with a focus on the community college budget and provide avenues for budget advocacy. The tool will have interactive components, including a time line of the state budget process with links to appropriate documents and websites. The chart the League sends out as part of its budget updates will be part of the package and will include links to explanations of the major line items. A glossary of terms and a budget basics narrative are also planned components. Currently, the goal is launch in conjunction with the League’s Legislative Conference.

Trustees expressed their pleasure with the new tool, especially the advocacy portion, which is something they have wanted to see developed.

3.3 CEO Tenure and Retention Study – 4th Update

Director of State Policy Research Rita Mize said the study was initiated in 1996 at the request of the CCCT board. She said retirements were the primary driver behind the current turnover rates. Because boards tend to hire college presidents to replace superintendents and chancellors, the vacancy rates double. She also noted that while “retirement” is the public reason given by many CEOs, a significant number are leaving under fire or ‘duress.’ The League has heard of eight additional CEOs who plan to retire this summer. Their average tenure is 7.9 years, so the average tenure of CEOs statewide will be driven down further when they leave.

Members discussed candidate pools, how to attract more high quality out-of-state candidates; the need for boards to support their presidents; the qualities a vice president needs to develop to be a good presidential candidate; Los Angeles CCD’s Administrative Leader Program for training vice
presidential level staff who want to move up; and the complexities of the search process with the large number of stakeholders in the campus community.

Scott Lay noted that the problems at Compton and more recently at Lassen were not simply fiscal, but also related to governance and trustee issues. The League is working hard on recruitment and retention of CEOs and has many resources related to CEO search and hiring processes which are available via our website and by mail.

3.4 Policy Developments in Accreditation

Accrediting Commission Executive Director Barbara Beno’s plane was delayed and she was not able to attend. Members requested the item be rescheduled.

4. Association Operation

4.1 CCCT Officers Nominating Committee

Rebecca Garcia reminded the board that it had changed its governing policies to allow the CCCT board president to present a slate of Officers Committee members for the board’s approval. She presented the 2007-08 CCCT Officers Nominating Committee of Rosanne Bader, Tom Clark, Paul Gomez and Maria Elena Serna. She also asked the board to consider the officers guidelines and act on them.

On a motion by Carolyn Batiste, the board approved the slate of Rosanne Bader, Tom Clark, Paul Gomez and Maria Elena Serna as the 2007-08 CCCT Officers Nominating Committee and adopted the officers guidelines.

4.2 CCCT Election Review

Rebecca Garcia said that the issue had been brought forward at a prior meeting and an ad hoc committee was to be established to look into the issues. Volunteers were solicited and Georgia Mercer, Reginaal James, Jeanette Mann, Andrew Quintero and Judy Beck volunteered. Rebecca asked Andre to serve as the chair of the committee. It was suggested an at-large member be solicited as well.

Members discussed the charge of the committee and suggested it look into the terms of office, areas of representation, work with staff to review ten years of board membership to see whether there is evidence of over or under representation and the findings should be reported out to all trustees. Members asked the committee to consider whether the officer rotation could be affected by changes to the terms of office.

5. Other

Members requested a trustee be added to the Commission on Athletics Board; that the League look into getting an 800 number; that an explanation of ‘credit,’ ‘noncredit’ and ‘for credit’ be given to the board; and announced that the Encuentos Leadership of North San Diego County, which is involved in reducing the drop out rate among Latino boys would hold a special work shop at the ACCT Congress. Scott informed the board that an 800 number was being looked into. In the past, it had been found to be cost prohibitive.
In response to a question about the status of Compton, Scott said that education classes are going forward via Compton’s status as a center of El Camino CCD, so the community is being served. $30 million was provided by the legislature to keep the center open, and funding is not the issue, rather it is whether the institution can be re-accredited. Local and System staffs are looking into that. Peter Landsberger is the special trustee at Compton.

Scott said that one of the good things to come out of the Compton situation was that people learned lessons and, as a result, did not wait as long to move to assist Lassen CCD, which had similar fiscal and governance issues. Doug Houston is the interim president at Lassen and Tom Henry is its special trustee.

Members thanked Scott for his quick responses to requests they made at the June 2007 meeting regarding issues for future agendas by adding several of those requests to the September agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Scott Lay
President and Chief Executive Officer

Prepared by Jody Ansell
Assistant Director
COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA
Budget Summary
LEAGUE OPERATING BUDGET
September 30, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>2007-08 Budget</th>
<th>9/30/07 Status</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>1,321,275</td>
<td>1,158,779</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Partners</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions/Workshops</td>
<td>555,500</td>
<td>107,986</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League on Call</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Services Program</td>
<td>931,500</td>
<td>295,061</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>23,263</td>
<td>5,047</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Theta Kappa Awards</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>24,682</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,052,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,612,058</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boards</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Partners Program</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention/Workshops</td>
<td>479,200</td>
<td>83,768</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League on Call</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Services Program</td>
<td>320,800</td>
<td>43,601</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website &amp; Association Management</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1,813,155</td>
<td>400,987</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Operations</td>
<td>208,406</td>
<td>65,993</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Theta Kappa Awards</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46,850</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,044,671</strong></td>
<td><strong>615,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET INCOME**
7,967
996,662
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-08 Budget</th>
<th>9/30/07 Status</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUES</strong></td>
<td>1,321,275</td>
<td>1,158,779</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORPORATE PARTNERS</strong></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVENTION/WORKSHOPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrations/Meals</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits/Sponsors</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>24,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONVENTION</strong></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>27,832</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrations/Meals</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRUSTEE EDUCATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Trustees Conference</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Trusteeship Workshop</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Trusteeship Workshop</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRUSTEE ED &amp; DEV</strong></td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>13,270</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEO EDUCATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Symposium</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ED AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Great Teachers Seminar</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>59,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Leadership Institute</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Great Teachers Leadership Colloquium</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asilomar Leadership Skills Seminar</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER ED/DEV SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>59,239</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAGUE ON CALL</strong></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT SERVICES PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>43,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Bonds</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Credit (Zions)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Purchase Program</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>21,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Insurance Program</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Information Resources</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>61,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Annuity Program</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Procedure Service</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>84,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining Database</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>73,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree Health Benefits JPA</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>8,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTRICT SERVICES PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>931,500</td>
<td>295,061</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-08 Budget</td>
<td>9/30/07 Status</td>
<td>% of Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses and Consultants Directory</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RENTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>23,263</td>
<td>5,047</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI THETA KAPPA AWARDS</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEREST</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>24,682</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>3,052,638</td>
<td>1,612,058</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOARDS OF DIRECTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Travel</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space/Meals</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Travel</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space/Meals</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEOCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Travel</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space/Meals</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/Recognition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS</strong></td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Legislation</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Education Services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on District Services</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORPORATE PARTNERS PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-08 Budget</td>
<td>9/30/07 Status</td>
<td>% of Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVENTION</strong></td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>19,670</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE</strong></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRUSTEE EDUCATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Trustees Conference</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Trusteeship Workshop</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Trusteeship Workshop</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>12,438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TRUSTEE ED &amp; DEV</strong></td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEO EDUCATION &amp; DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Symposium</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CEO Meetings</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CEO ED &amp; DEV</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER ED AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Great Teachers Seminar</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>44,532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Leadership Institute</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Great Teachers Colloquium</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asilomar Leadership Skills Seminar</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER ED/DEV SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>130,200</td>
<td>47,675</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAGUE ON CALL</strong></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT SERVICES PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Business Income Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Procedures</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Bonds</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Purchase Program</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining Database</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>20,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Annuity Program</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree Health Benefits JPA</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTRICT SERVICES PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td>320,800</td>
<td>43,601</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICATIONS(PRINTING &amp; POSTAGE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NEWS</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League In Action</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Handbook/Guides</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses &amp; Consultants Directory</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Other Publications</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEBSITE &amp; ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-08 Budget</td>
<td>9/30/2007 Status</td>
<td>% of Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>1,277,124</td>
<td>296,494</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security &amp; Unemployment Taxes</td>
<td>97,231</td>
<td>21,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>190,787</td>
<td>42,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Plan</td>
<td>186,013</td>
<td>32,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td>474,031</td>
<td>96,393</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Services</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Policy &amp; Research</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Policy</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Travel</strong></td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Development</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Search</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Relations</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STAFF</strong></td>
<td>1,813,155</td>
<td>400,987</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier/Leg.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Supplies</strong></td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Postage</strong></td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommunications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Telecommunications</strong></td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment (Maintenance, Rental)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiers</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Maintenance/Upgrade</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Maint./Development</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Meter Rental/Maintenance</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX (Maintenance &amp; Phone Charges)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2007-08 Budget</td>
<td>9/30/07 Status</td>
<td>% of Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment (Maintenance, Rental) continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier (Maintenance/Copy charges)</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Maintenance/Upgrade</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Maint./Development</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Machine Maintenance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX (Maintenance &amp; Phone Charges)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Equipment Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>44,180</td>
<td>17,987</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>18,426</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Repair</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Street office</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Housing</strong></td>
<td>97,026</td>
<td>24,668</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,455</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference Library</strong></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Bill Room</strong></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Communications System</strong></td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OFFICE OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>208,406</td>
<td>65,993</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Services</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>8,363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBERSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI THETA KAPPA AWARDS</strong></td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Filing Fees, etc.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges/Online Credit Card Fees</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER</strong></td>
<td>46,850</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>3,044,671</td>
<td>615,396</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME (LOSS)</strong></td>
<td>7,967</td>
<td>996,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>9/30/07</td>
<td>9/30/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated (long term assets minus liabilities)</td>
<td>220,429</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical Reserves (current assets minus liabilities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>250,008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Furnishings</td>
<td>150,729</td>
<td>13,678&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>137,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>243,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>243,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>604,475</td>
<td>42,288&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>562,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,248,962</td>
<td>55,966</td>
<td>1,192,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets</td>
<td>1,469,391</td>
<td>55,966</td>
<td>1,413,425&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Furniture/equipment - O Street League display deposit 8,678 5,000 13,678

<sup>2</sup> Strategic Plan Community College Initiative 40,226 EDGE Campaign 1,207 42,288

* Board policy requires a minimum of 33.3% of expenditures ($1,013,875 for FY 2008).
## COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE

### Income From Conferences/Workshops

**FY 1991 - FY 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year End 6/30</th>
<th>Association Revenue</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Conference Revenue</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Conference Net Income</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
<th>% of Conf. Net Income to Assoc. Revenue</th>
<th>% of Conf. Net Income to Conference Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,404,436</td>
<td></td>
<td>364,269</td>
<td></td>
<td>92,729</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,298,939</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>297,242</td>
<td>(18.4)</td>
<td>77,176</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,289,881</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>287,291</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>65,270</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,297,470</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>290,484</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>78,974</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,394,753</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>294,110</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>68,883</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,338,703</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>282,817</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>65,473</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,450,987</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>338,740</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>91,688</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,786,757 *</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>365,634</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>78,751</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,720,283</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>363,841</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>94,682</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,813,985</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>404,189</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>102,377</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,148,928</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>426,614</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>73,534</td>
<td>(26.2)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,235,628</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>395,874</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
<td>88,521</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,698,022</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>413,552</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>95,782</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,765,880</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>384,579</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>131,404</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,793,381</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>571,485</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>165,217</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,184,358</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>594,362</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>137,135</td>
<td>(17.0)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,170,687</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>718,886</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>158,613</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one time legal settlement of $150,000.00
## COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE

### Staff Compensation

**FY 1991 - FY 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Association Expenditures</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Staff Compensation</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
<th>% of Expenditures</th>
<th>Full Time Equivalent</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,292,114</td>
<td></td>
<td>571,394</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,255,958</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
<td>615,531</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,312,959</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>635,369</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,282,790</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
<td>672,743</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,329,800</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>658,957</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,358,754</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>714,568</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,449,195</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>745,293</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,637,969</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>794,202</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,647,935</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>901,431</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,740,229</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>974,248</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,999,960</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,080,959</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,207,944</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1,188,570</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,621,868</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1,341,189</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,717,287</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,369,440</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,797,947</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,497,741</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,968,816</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1,481,441</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,944,408</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1,566,273</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Salaries, health insurance, taxes, and pension.

1995 - Cindra Smith was on educational leave.
1999 - Joined CalPERS pension plan.
## Community College League
(and its predecessor organizations)

### Fiscal Data
**FY 1989 - FY 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year End 6/30</th>
<th>Statewide Revenue</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Association Revenue</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Association Expenditures</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Association Equity</th>
<th>% of Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2,551,978,184</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1,281,395</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1,268,771</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>313,250</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,890,014,752</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1,406,508</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1,284,694</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>435,064</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,084,082,178</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1,404,436</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>1,292,114</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>547,386</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,074,030,031</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>1,298,939</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>1,255,958</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
<td>590,367</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3,120,725,418</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,289,881</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>1,312,959</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>567,289</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,144,199,903</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,297,470</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,282,790</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
<td>581,969</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,183,622,578</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,394,753</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1,329,800</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>646,922</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,384,628,090</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1,338,703</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>1,358,754</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>626,871</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3,656,649,536</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1,450,987</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1,449,195</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>628,663</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4,025,770,615</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1,786,757</td>
<td>(21.8)</td>
<td>1,637,959</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>757,451</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4,424,870,469</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1,720,283</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>1,647,935</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>629,799</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,149,989,232</td>
<td>-28.8</td>
<td>1,813,965</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1,740,229</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>603,555</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,422,468,917</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2,148,928</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1,999,980</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,052,503</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,646,243,612</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2,235,628</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2,207,944</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1,080,187</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,728,494,996</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2,698,022</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2,621,888</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1,156,341</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,782,827,854</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,765,880</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,717,287</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,204,934</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,019,150,541</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2,793,381</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2,797,947</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,200,368</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,535,790,310</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3,184,358</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2,968,816</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1,200,368</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,170,687</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2,944,408</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1,469,391</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one time legal settlement of $150,000.00.*

---

**Community College League**
(and its predecessor organizations)

- **Revenue**
- **Expenditures**
- **Equity**
## COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE

**Non-dues and Non-conference**

**FY 1991 - FY 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year End 6/30</th>
<th>Association Revenue</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
<th>Other Revenue*</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,404,436</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,409</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,298,939</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>69,033</td>
<td>(22.8)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,289,881</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>65,261</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,297,470</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>68,780</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,394,753</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>109,579</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,338,703</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>112,133</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,450,987</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>116,884</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,766,757</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>363,446</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,720,283</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>319,959</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,813,985</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>338,157</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,148,928</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>615,165</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,235,628</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>695,935</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,698,022</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1,133,632</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,765,680</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,190,721</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,793,381</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,127,978</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,184,358</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1,433,916</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,170,687</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>1,252,427</td>
<td>(12.7)</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹Includes one time legal settlement of $150,00.00.

---

**Other Income**

- **Percentage:**
  - 2001: 5.0%
  - 2002: 5.3%
  - 2003: 5.2%
  - 2004: 5.1%
  - 2005: 5.0%
  - 2006: 4.9%
  - 2007: 4.8%

- **Fiscal Year:**
  - 2001: 5.0%
  - 2002: 5.3%
  - 2003: 5.2%
  - 2004: 5.1%
  - 2005: 5.0%
  - 2006: 4.9%
  - 2007: 4.8%
END OF YEAR LEGISLATIVE REPORT
BILLS OF INTEREST

AB 262  Credit Card Marketing (Coto)
Summary: This bill would urge the UC Regents, and require the CSU Trustees and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, effective July 1, 2012, to:
- annually disclose all exclusive arrangements with banks and financial institutions about marketing credit cards to students; and
- prohibit banks and other commercial entities from offering gifts to students for filling out student credit card applications; and
- allow banks and other commercial entities to rely on the self-identification of students for purposes of complying with this requirements.

Position: Watch

Final Action: Signed by Governor

AB 314  CalWORKS: Welfare-to-Work Activities (Soto)
Summary: As part of a welfare-to-work activity eligible for aid under the CalWORKS program, this bill would allow counties to include structured, monitored credit or non-credit hours spent in classes or other activities for:
- English-as-a-second-language;
- Job skills related directly to employment;
- Vocational education and/or training; or
- Leading to a certificate of general educational development, if the student has not completed secondary school.

Position: Support

Final Action: Vetoed – “Since the passage of the Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, California needs to increase work participation rates in the CalWORKS program. Failure to meet federal work requirements will lead to federal penalties and threatens our financial ability to retain a strong safety net for low-income children and working families. I believe comprehensive reform, not piecemeal changes are needed. It is premature to consider this proposal in the context of all other options to increase California’s work participation rate.”

AB 483  Contracting (Salas)
Summary: This bill would authorize the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to evaluate and determine the effectiveness for community college districts of the public contracting limits that apply specifically to the community colleges (any construction project with a cost exceeding $15,000) and contracting limits set forth under the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (for any construction project with a cost exceeding $30,000) which can be used by public agencies when, by resolution, they elect to become subject to the cost accounting procedures established under the
UPCCAA. The bill also deletes the requirement that the California Community College Chancellor contract for an independent evaluation of the Economic and Workforce Development Program.

Position: Support

**Final Action: Vetoes** – “Nothing in current law prohibits the BOG from conducting a study... this bill is unnecessary.”

---

**AB 598** Career Technical Education (Committee on Education)

*Summary:* This bill would authorize a community college or apprentice training instructor to teach a career technical education course in a subject that is not a core academic subject on a high school campus; authorize a high school pupil to take an apprenticeship, job training, or community college career technical education course after regular school hours for credit; and authorize a school district to bring in professionals as guest lecturers for career technical education courses.

Position: Support

**Final Action: Vetoes** – “While I support improving access to Career Technical Education (CTE) courses for all high school students, I do not believe that this bill is necessary or clear in its intent. Current law already allows for high school students to attend community college CTE courses for high school or college credit, and does not prohibit the use of guest lecturers on high school campuses...”

---

**AB 668** Financial Aid (Portantino)

*Summary:* This bill would establish legislative intent to increase the number of Pell Grant recipients, improve access for low-income students, and require the System Office to develop a statement and request that colleges require students to sign that statement informing them of available federal and state funds and the availability of assistance from financial aid offices; and requests that colleges provide BOG fee-waiver recipients who did not apply for federal student aid, with information about federal student aid.

Position: Watch

**Final Action: Signed by Governor**

---

**AB 962** Speech Language Pathologists (Houston)

*Summary:* This bill would express legislative declarations about the need for additional paraprofessional services in speech-language pathology (SLP), declare legislative intent to explore the development of additional programs in the community colleges to train these paraprofessionals, and require the Chancellor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to report, by June 1, 2008, using existing revenues, on the issues and possible barriers to creating additional SLP paraprofessional training programs.

Position: Watch

**Final Action: Signed by Governor**

---
AB 1168  Social Security Numbers (Jones)
Summary: This bill would declare legislative intent that all local agencies to redact all digits of any social security number contained in records before disclosing them to the public. It also would require the Office of Privacy Protection in the Department of Consumer Affairs to establish a task force of 15 members (including 9 from higher education institutions or organizations) to conduct a review of the use by all public and private colleges and universities of social security numbers in order to recommend practices to minimize the collection, use, storage, and retention of social security numbers. It would require the task force to commence meetings by May 1, 2008, and on or before July 1, 2010, to submit a report of its findings and recommendations to minimize the collection, use, storage, and retention of social security records at California colleges and universities, to the Assembly and Senate Committees on Judiciary, with the findings and recommendations informational only and not binding on any college or university.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

AB 1368  Capital Facilities Bonds (Mullin)
Summary: This bill would authorize each district to issue notes in anticipation of the sale of bonds that mature within a period not to exceed 5 years, rather than one year, as at present.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

AB 1548  Textbooks (Solorio)
Summary: This bill would require that publishers provide faculty and others at the colleges with “transparency in the adoption process” and be responsive to requests for information on textbook cost, content and options. Publishers would also be required to provide faculty with a list of products offered, the price at which the new book is available from the publisher, the copyright date of any prior edition, and a list of substantive differences between the current and previous editions, effective January 2010. This bill would require campus bookstores to post in their store or on their websites a disclosure of its retail pricing policy, require public postsecondary institutions to encourage faculty and others to adopt materials with sufficient lead time, and state that this shall not be construed as attempting to interfere with faculty authority over textbook selection decisions.

Position: Neutral – CEOCCC
Support – CCCT

Final Action: Signed by Governor

AB 1559  Community College Nursing Education Programs (Berryhill)
Summary: This bill would require that if a community college district elects to use a multicriteria screening process on or after January 1, 2008, it must include specific criteria for evaluating applicants. These criteria include: academic performance, work or volunteer experience, foreign language skills, life experiences and special circumstances of the applicant. This bill also would authorize community colleges which elect to use a multi-criteria screening process to use an approved diagnostic assessment tool before, during, or after the multi-criteria screening process and require each district using such measures to annually report to the Chancellor on its nursing program admission policies. The elements of
this bill would then sunset on January 1, 2016. It would require the Legislative Analyst’s Office to evaluate the use and efficacy of the admission process for community college registered nursing programs and report its findings and recommendations as part of its annual budget analysis, commencing with the 2009-10 fiscal year budget.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

**AB 1598**  
Alcoholic Beverages (Price)  
*Summary:* This bill would allow local governing boards to authorize the acquisition, possession, use, sale, and consumption of beer or wine in connection with a course of instruction, sponsored dinner, or meal demonstration given as part of a culinary arts program at a community college campus.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

**SB 1**  
Dream Act (Cedillo)  
*Summary:* This bill would provide eligibility for all “540” students to receive: BOG fee waivers, non-competitive Cal Grant awards, and private student aid awards if these students meet the requirements of existing law.

Position: Support

**Final Action:** Vetoed — “At a time when segments of California public higher education..., it would not be prudent to place additional strain on the General Fund to accord the new benefit of providing state subsidized financial aid to students without lawful immigration status. Under existing law, undocumented students, who meet the required criteria, already qualify for the lower in-state tuition rate while attending California public colleges and universities.”

**SB 18**  
Public Works: Labor Compliance Programs (Perata)  
*Summary:* This bill would add the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 as a source of funds for a public works project that would require an awarding body to initiate and enforce, or contract with a third party to initiate and enforce, a labor compliance program.

Position: Watch

**Final Action:** Vetoed — “This bill would require the expenditure of funds from the 2006 education bond in order to fund labor compliance programs run by either the awarding body or a third party... These programs are expensive and have generated a paltry number of complaints and violations. This measure fails to address any of the problems raised in the report but instead proposes to simply continue to fund these underachieving programs... We must look at new ways to ensure every worker on every project is receiving the wages and benefits to which he or she is entitled. Although I cannot sign this measure, I am directing my Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development to work with all interested parties to achieve this goal.”
SB 139  Nursing Education (Scott)
Summary: This bill would make clarifying and technical changes to SB 1309 (Chapter 837, Statutes of 2006) to increase California's nursing workforce. It also would prohibit CSU and community college campuses from requiring students who have been admitted to a nursing program and have already earned a baccalaureate degree to take any coursework that is not necessary to prepare him/her for licensing as a nurse.

In screening nursing applicants, this bill would allow a community college district to use any diagnostic assessment tool that is commonly used in registered nursing programs and approved by the Chancellor; allow it to use additional multiple screening measures if the number of program applicants exceeds its capacity; and expressly would not prohibit nursing programs from using an approved diagnostic assessment tool before or after use of a multicriteria screening process. It would prohibit districts from excluding applicants to a registered nursing program solely because the applicant is not a district resident or has not completed prerequisite courses in that district. This bill also would allow districts to employ part-time clinical nursing faculty teaching 60% or more of the hours of a full-time instructor for up to four semesters or six quarters within any three consecutive academic years between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2014; require these districts to provide data to the System Office regarding the number of faculty members hired under this section and the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty for these districts in each of the three academic years prior to the operation of this section, and for each academic year for which faculty are hired under this subdivision; but would not allow a district to employ such a person if it results in an increase in the part-time to full-time faculty ratio in that district. The bill also expresses legislative intent that, pursuant to funding in the Budget Act for 2009-10 and each succeeding academic year, community colleges should increase the statewide enrollment of full-time equivalent registered nursing students by 900 annually.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

SB 166  Emergency Preparedness (Negrete McLeod)
Summary: This bill would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the Governor's Office of Emergency Services and the Office of Homeland Security, to develop emergency preparedness standards and guidelines, by January 1, 2009, to assist community college districts and campuses in responding to a natural disaster, hazardous condition, or terrorist activity.

Position: Watch

Final Action: Signed by Governor

SB 272  Armed Forces; Enrollment Priority (George Runner)
Summary: This bill would require CSU and each community college, and request UC, to give priority for registration for enrollment in classes to current or former members of the US Armed Forces for any academic term attended within two years of leaving active duty; and would also require priority for registration for any student compelled to take an academic leave of absence due to being called to active duty.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor
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SB 283  Board of Governors: Student Representation (Maldonado)
Summary: This bill would replace the California Student Association of Community Colleges (CalSACC) with the student organization recognized by the Board of Governors as the statewide organization that submits names to the Governor for appointment of student representation to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

---

SB 614  Design-Build Contracts (Simitian)
Summary: This bill would expand the “design/build” authority for facilities over $2.5 million to all community college districts (instead of the current law which limits it to 3 districts with projects over $10 million), would define “plans” to include plans for foundations and other building systems as determined by the Division of the State Architect, would prohibit school and community college districts from withholding more than 5% from payments due to the design-build entity if a performance bond issued by an admitted surety insurer is required in the bid solicitation as well as prohibit withholding more than 5% from payments due to subcontractors, and would extend the current sunset date for these provisions from January 2010 to January 2014.

Position: Support

Final Action: Signed by Governor

---

SB 832  Textbooks (Corbett)
Summary: This bill would add the College Textbook Affordability Act to the Donahoe Higher Education Act and require that the publisher, agent, or employee of a textbook publisher provide prospective purchasers (defined as “the faculty member who selects the textbooks for her/her students”) at public postsecondary education institutions with:
- A complete list of all products offered for sale by that publisher and that are germane to the subject area of interest to the prospective purchaser;
- For each product on the list, the wholesale price of that product and the estimated length of time the publisher intends to keep that product on the market, and
- A complete list of all substantive differences or changes made between the current and the most recent edition of the textbook.

Position: Support

Final Action: Vetoed – “I am supportive of efforts to address the cost of college textbooks and share the concern that these education costs have an impact on the affordability of college for many students. However, this bill focuses strictly on textbook publisher policies and fails to recognize that the affordability of textbooks is a shared responsibility among publishers, college bookstores, and faculty members. Therefore, instead of this bill, I am signing Assembly Bill 1548. Many of the same concepts in SB 832 are included in AB 1548, but AB 1548 recognizes the shared responsibility and attempts to address the issue in a more comprehensive manner.”
SB 854  Voter Registration: Students (Ridley-Thomas)
Summary: This bill would require every community college, CSU campus, and request every UC campus, that operates an automated class registration system on or before January 1, 2008, to make the voter registration process available, by January 1, 2010, through an automated program in coordination with the Secretary of State, that permits students, during the class registration process, to elect to receive voter registration material that is preprinted with personal information required for voter registration and to designate a contact person for the Secretary of State to contact to facilitate the distribution of voter registration cards, and require the Secretary of State to report annually to the Legislature by January 1 on its student voter registration efforts. It also would require any community college or CSU campus that does not have an automated registration program to implement an automated voter registration program within two years of beginning automated registration.

Position: Support if amended (to provide funding)

Final Action: Signed by Governor

---

SB 964  Open Meetings: Brown Act (Romero)
Summary: This bill would prohibit a majority of members of a legislative body (including a community college board of trustees) from using a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of that board. In doing so, it would supersede the holding of the court in Wolfe vs. City of Fremont which said that serial meetings violate the act only when they involve a personal intermediary for members of a local legislative body and result in a majority actually reaching a collective concurrence regarding a matter to be considered by the body. It also would provide that when the members of a legislative body are authorized to access a document of that body or local agency, the local agency shall not discriminate between or among any of those members as to which document or portion of it is made available or when it is made available, and shall not charge any of those members a fee to inspect or obtain a copy of that document.

Position: Oppose unless amended (to clarify the ability of staffs to brief their boards)

Final Action: Vetoed – “It is of the utmost importance to ensure openness and transparency of local government decision making... In its attempt to solve the issue, this bill imposes an impractical standard for compliance on local officials and could potentially prohibit communication among officials and agency staff outside of a public meeting.”

####
CCCT Legislator of the Year Award

(Action)

Background
The following criteria and process were approved at the April 2005 CCCT meeting and reviewed at subsequent CCCT board meetings, most recently in November 2006, at which time the board asked staff to adjust the timeline because it wanted to present the award(s) at the League’s January Legislative Conference rather than the May CCCT Conference.

This year, legislators are just now beginning to add their names to the list of Proposition 92 supporters as other major groups endorse it. CCCT President Garcia suggested that this year only, the award be presented at the May CCCT Conference, to allow time for consideration of legislators’ positions on Proposition 92.

Criteria
- Legislative Package – Has the legislator introduced legislation consistent with CCCT’s legislative goals?
- Voting Record – Has the legislator consistently voted for the interests of community colleges in general, and more specifically, in support of a strong, bilaterally governed community college system that maintains the maximum degree permissible of local control and authority?
- Leadership on Community College Issues – Has the legislator taken the lead on community college issues, particularly in a manner that might have required special focus or difference with the leadership of his or her caucus?

Process
Step One: Local trustees will nominate individuals for recognition by January 11, 2008.
Step Two: League staff will, if deemed appropriate, add names to the list submitted by local trustees.
Step Three: Staff will forward the nominations, along with supporting material, if necessary, to the executive committee. The committee will identify which, if any, legislator(s) should be recognized.
Step Four: The recommendations of the selection committee will brought to the CCCCT board at its January 26 meeting.
Step Five: The recognition will be made at the League’s annual CCCT Conference.

Recommendation
The board should review the criteria and process outlined above and determine if the criteria are still appropriate and if it agrees with the suggested process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Courses</th>
<th>Amount Funded per FTES by State</th>
<th>Total Number of FTES Funded</th>
<th>Repeatability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT - Degree Applicable</td>
<td>$4,367 + COLA State Supported</td>
<td>1,040,871</td>
<td>Limited repeatability;</td>
<td>To prepare students for degree and certificate programs, transfer and employment. Content and objectives are &quot;college level.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT - NON DEGREE APPLICABLE</td>
<td>$4,367 + COLA State Supported</td>
<td>Limited to 30 semester units per student</td>
<td></td>
<td>To prepare students to succeed in college-level work. Content and objectives are preparatory for &quot;college level&quot; work. While these courses cannot be credited toward degrees, they may apply to certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONCREDIT</td>
<td>$2,025 + COLA State Supported</td>
<td>60,418</td>
<td>Not subject to repeatability limits.</td>
<td>To prepare students to achieve academic, career and lifelong learning goals, including preparing to succeed in college level work. Nine categories (1) Parenting; (2) Elementary and secondary basic skills; (3) English as a second language; (4) Citizenship courses for immigrants; (5) Ed programs for disabled; (6) Short-term Voc Ed; (7) Programs for older adults; (8) Home Economics courses; (9) Health / Safety programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCED NONCREDIT</td>
<td>$3,092 + COLA State Supported</td>
<td>35,855</td>
<td>Not subject to repeatability limits.</td>
<td>Career development &amp; college preparation courses for which no credit is given and that are offered in a sequence of courses leading to a certificate of completion, that lead to improved employability, or to a certificate of competency in a recognized career field by articulating with college-level coursework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses designed to develop reading or writing skills at or below the level required for enrollment in English courses one level below freshman composition, computational skills required in mathematics courses below Algebra, and ESL courses at levels consistent with those defined for English. Funds shall be expended for program and curriculum planning and development, student assessment, advisement and counseling services, supplemental instruction and tutoring, articulation, instructional materials and equipment, and any other purpose directly related to the enhancement of basic skills, ESL instruction, and related student programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>Limited repeatability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR rate $4,367 + COLA State Supported</td>
<td>Geared for pupils who would benefit from advanced scholastic or vocational work with the intent to provide educational enrichment opportunities for a limited number of eligible pupils. Among the courses eligible for attendance are: lower division, college-level courses for credit that are designated as part of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or applied toward the General Education breadth requirements of the CSU or part of a sequence of vocational or career technical education courses leading to a degree or certificate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT EDUCATION</th>
<th>Not subject to repeatability limits. To respond to learning needs of the local employers and other public and private institutions. Content and objectives are defined to meet customer/employer's needs. Not subject to Chancellor's Office approval. Can be offered in any instructional mode or as training or services. Customer selects students to attend, unless admission is open to public. Fees determined by contract and type of course (e.g., open or closed).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally admission is closed to the public and course is not funded by state. The contract must meet all costs incurred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>Amount Funded per FTES by State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supported by state funds</td>
<td>Data not collected by MIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

At their March 6, 2007, meeting, the Board of Governors passed the following motion:

The Chancellor is directed to begin the process of evaluating the implementation of a system-wide uniform, common assessment with multiple measures of all community college students in consultation with the Community College League of California, Academic Senate and other community college partners for consideration and adoption by the Board of Governors by not later than November 2007. This evaluation shall be in concert with the System Strategic Plan and implementation process. In addition, and integral to the above, the Chancellor shall study policy strategies for consideration by the Board of Governors in the following areas: non-barrier access, student success, early assessment, orientation, prerequisites, failure to participate, funding, exemptions.

At the April meeting of the Consultation Council, the council approved the creation of a task force to address the Board’s motion, with the membership listed at the front of this report.

Discussions amongst the members of the Board prior to adoption of the motion revealed several motivations beyond the larger goal of improving student success. First, especially in light of the focus brought to the issue by the successful first stages of the Basic Skills Initiative, the Board hoped to establish a common baseline measurement for the system by which to measure improvement in basic skills instruction, which in turn could be used to support further requests of support from the state. Second, the Board was concerned with the testing burden experienced by the increasing numbers of students enrolling at more than one community college. Anecdotal evidence seemed to suggest that students had to be re-assessed at each college they attended before enrollment, which impacted not only students but also implied a waste of limited college resources to fund the re-assessment. Third, several reports reviewed by the Board at its study session immediately preceding the March meeting offered evidence to support mandatory assessment as leading to increased success in basic skills, including the review of the literature done for the Basic Skills Initiative (Center for Student Success 2007).

Because the System is already working through other advisory committees to craft measurements to assess progress in basic skills improvement, the Consultation Council Task Force on Assessment (Task Force) focused its work on conducting a survey on practices related to the process of assessment for placement (See Appendix C for survey questions and summary of closed-ended responses) to address the second and third issues. In this work, the Task Force was assisted by System Office staff from the Research and Planning and Matriculation units. Thanks to the perseverance of staff, responses to the survey were collected from all 109 community colleges in the system.

In addition to the data collected through the survey, this report incorporates MIS data and findings and comments from other reports, several published after the Board of Governors’ March meeting. This report also includes information on testing costs presented at the March study session on assessment and recommendations from the Consultation Council’s previous Matriculation Assessment/Placement Task Force.
Based on the data from the survey and MIS reports, as well as findings from recently published reports, the Task Force formulated recommendations to bring before the Board of Governors for discussion, approval, and implementation. The report is organized by topic, with pertinent recommendations immediately following the discussion of each topic. A complete list of recommendations is collected together at the end of the report.

**Putting Assessment into a Larger Context**

The *California Community Colleges System Strategic Plan* was developed to provide “a comprehensive road map for improving student access and success.” Under Goal B: Student Success and Readiness, the plan specifically recommends the development of “methods to more effectively assess student preparedness levels and to place students in appropriate courses.”

However, assessment for the purposes of placement in a course is but one of the components of matriculation. Matriculation is a process that provides students with a series of steps to follow to promote success in their educational pursuits. When followed, these steps ensure that students have accurate and timely information, assist them to establish educational goals, and help them to achieve these goals. As defined in Title 5 §55520, matriculation *minimally* comprises these components:

- Application for admission
- Assessment
- Orientation
- Counseling or advisement
- Development of an educational plan
- Evaluation of progress
- Support services such as financial aid, health services, tutoring
- Specialized curriculum such as basic skills and English as a Second Language (ESL) courses.

While it is important to address the issues of assessment and placement specifically, the components of matriculation must be supported as a whole to work effectively. For example, without adequate orientation for students to the expectations in academic preparation needed to succeed in a community college, students might defer addressing the needs identified in an assessment process. While assessment may assist a student in determining the best initial steps to take, failure to work with a counselor to develop an educational plan can result in a delay for the student in achieving his/her educational objective.

Nancy Shulock and Colleen Moore’s report *Rules of the Game* (2007) was a review of system policies where the authors looked at the interaction of these policies, rather than at individual policies alone; and their conclusion is that our system operates under interacting policies that actually serve as barriers to student success. Shulock and Moore specifically mention that existing policies encourage students to avoid getting assessed and to avoid or delay enrolling in courses addressing academic preparation, and they make it clear that ultimately the larger context of system policies needs to be reformed in order to address these problems.
Thus, while the Board’s focus on assessment can help to improve student success, the extent to which a singular focus on assessment can improve overall student achievement and the attainment of student goals is limited.

Assessment of All Community College Students

Mandatory assessment is cited by numerous sources as an effective practice. A good summary of studies that support this contention are found in the Basic Skills Initiative literature review *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges* (Center for Student Success 2007).

Mandatory assessment implies that all students are assessed. This is not the current situation in the California Community Colleges. As a part of matriculation practice, under Title 5 §55532 each college may establish policies which exempt students from matriculation, and by extension from assessment for placement. The criteria for setting the exemption policy are left up to the colleges for determination. While this regulatory section specifically allows a college to exempt a student from matriculation if he/she has already attained an associate degree or higher, a college is not required to do so. In addition, there is also a regulatory stipulation that specific criteria may not be used as the sole criterion for establishing an exemption. These criteria include the number of units, a student’s expressed goal or lack thereof, and whether a student is exclusively enrolled in evening classes. What this means is that a college cannot exempt a student from matriculation simply because he has declared a goal of personal enrichment. An additional criterion must be employed as part of the college’s policy. Equally, a college cannot exempt a student from matriculation simply because she is taking fewer than six units. However, a college may exempt a student from matriculation if she has both declared a goal of personal enrichment and is taking fewer than six units.

According to the Task Force survey, criteria for exemption from matriculation vary widely. Of note is the fact that exemption criteria differ depending on the assessment test. In addition, not all colleges exempt students from matriculation even if they hold a bachelor’s degree from a U.S. university. Specifically, six colleges do not exempt students from the English assessment, ten from the mathematics assessment, and 23 from the ESL assessment, even if the student already has a bachelor’s degree.

How Many Students are being Assessed

Based on a review of matriculation data for Fall 2006 (accessed through the Datamart on the System Office website on 09.25.07), college exemption policies can be applied to individual components of the matriculation process. As the tables below show, the numbers of students exempted from these components of matriculation differ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-Credit*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directed to Orientation</td>
<td>950,791</td>
<td>22,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted from Orientation</td>
<td>464,478</td>
<td>206,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Orientation</td>
<td>711,354</td>
<td>20,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Received Orientation</td>
<td>702,024</td>
<td>208,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused Orientation</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Orientation for Students Enrolled as of Fall 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Assessment Services</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-Credit*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directed to Assessment Testing</td>
<td>983,838</td>
<td>23,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted from Assessment Testing</td>
<td>431,431</td>
<td>205,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Placement Testing Only</td>
<td>579,923</td>
<td>9,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Other Measures of Testing Only</td>
<td>62,057</td>
<td>16,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Skills Assessment Services Based on Both of the Above</td>
<td>244,525</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Received Placement Testing</td>
<td>526,462</td>
<td>199,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused Assessment Placement Services</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Placement Assessment Services for Students Enrolled as of Fall 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-Credit*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directed to Counseling Services</td>
<td>977,895</td>
<td>22,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted from Counseling Services</td>
<td>437,374</td>
<td>206,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Student Education Plan (SEP) Counseling During the Term</td>
<td>52,218</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Other Counseling During the Term</td>
<td>185,790</td>
<td>4,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received SEP and Other Counseling During the Term</td>
<td>179,237</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Received Counseling During the Term</td>
<td>997,449</td>
<td>223,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused Counseling During the Term</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>1,415,269</td>
<td>228,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Counseling Services for Students Enrolled as of Fall 2006*

Of the 1,415,269 students enrolled in credit instruction in Fall 2006, 464,478 (32.8%) were exempted from orientation, 431,431 (30.5%) were exempted from assessment, and 437,374 (20.9%) were exempted from counseling services. While these numbers appear high, it is also important to note that MIS data show that 215,183 students enrolled already had an associate degree or higher. A look at the numbers for noncredit instruction show that fewer than 10% of students enrolled in noncredit are directed to matriculation services.

In these tables, the term “directed” equates to the concept of required or mandatory. It is therefore of great relevance and perhaps concern to see how many students fail to receive mandatory matriculation services. Of the students directed to assessment, only 92,729 (9.4%) failed to be assessed. In the area of orientation, the figure is more alarming with 239,437 (25.1%) not receiving mandated orientation. The figure for counseling services is abysmal, with more than half of students (559,500 or 56.1%) failing to receive mandated counseling services.

Report of the Consultation Council Task Force on Assessment (October 2007)
While the Board has expressed a particular interest in reviewing exemption policies, MIS data make it clear that current funding does not even support the matriculation services that are currently mandated, and in fact, it is in the area of assessment that colleges are doing best. It is impossible to examine the effect of current exemption policies given that currently mandated matriculation components are not fully funded.

Assessment without orientation and counseling services denies a student the information he/she needs to make an informed choice about which classes to take, including the importance of addressing basic skills issues early. The Basic Skills literature review (Center for Student Success 2007) also identifies as an effective practice that “counseling support provided is substantial, accessible, and integrated with academic courses/programs.”

It is clear that simply requiring all directed students be subject to required matriculation components would make a big difference in providing the guidance students need. However, this would come at a significant cost.

The Cost of Fully Funding the Assessment Process

In order to provide a ballpark figure for the additional cost of fully funding mandated assessment, this report uses information prepared by the System Office (see Appendix A). The System estimates the per student cost of assessing English and mathematics at $4.65. This figure does not include assessment using a writing sample, which incurs a much higher cost due to the expense of paying for evaluators; nor does the cost extend to staff, equipment, or facilities. For the additional 97,333 students that should be assessed, the cost would amount to slightly over $452,598.

It is impossible to know how many additional students would need to be assessed were exemption policies more stringent. However, if only students who had already attained a degree were exempted, the total cost to fund assessment for these students beyond our current levels (n=313,581) would be an additional $1.46 million.

The cost of fully funding mandated counseling services under existing exemption policies would be far greater. To fully fund mandated counseling services (students not served less those exempted; n=560,075), using the current system ratio of counselor to students of 1:1,918 and the conservative estimate of $60,000 per counselor (factoring in a mix of full- and part-time counselors) would require in excess of $17 million. If we were to use the ratio of 1:900 recommended by the Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling (Academic Senate 2003), the cost would rise to over $37 million. Using a Carnegie report recommended ratio of 1:300 cited in that same document, the cost would escalate to $112 million.

Recommendations

While the board has expressed an interest in exploring exemption policies as one way to increase the number of students being assessed, since mandatory matriculation services are not even now
being fully funded, an evaluation of the effectiveness of exemption policies is not feasible. Therefore, the Task Force makes the following recommendation in this area.

- The State should fully fund mandatory matriculation services in order to allow colleges to implement exemption policies based on maximizing student success rather than on financial limitations. Matriculation funding should receive annual COLA and growth funding.

**Messaging to High School Students**

The issue of use of the Early Assessment Program (CSU) with community college students is currently being addressed through legislation (SB946 - Scott). Support for use of the EAP was endorsed by the faculty, CIOs, CSSOs, and matriculation professionals in the work of the Consultation Council’s Matriculation Assessment/Placement Task Force in 2006:

If CSU informs a student of his/her readiness for college work as a result of the Early Assessment Program (EAP), CSU English Placement Test (EPT) and/or the Elementary Level Mathematics (ELM) test, community colleges may allow those students to enter directly into Freshman Composition and/or a mathematics course with intermediate algebra as a prerequisite.

In their paper *Beyond the Open Door: Increasing Student Success in the California Community Colleges*, Colleen Moore and Nancy Shulock further explore policies that affect the community colleges and changes that need to be made to foster greater student success. Two of the recommendations they make relate directly to the messages that high school students receive, or rather do not receive, about college. The research that they conducted for the paper reinforces other studies that show that encouraging students to go directly to college after high school yields greater retention and successful outcomes. Thus, their first recommendation is to facilitate this movement directly from high school into community colleges. The second recommendation is that the community colleges need to do a better job of conveying the standards of preparation needed to succeed in college. While they acknowledge that it will be difficult to standardize assessment testing throughout the California Community College system, as is supported by Brown and Niemi (2007), they emphasize that colleges can still increase their communication with high school students.

In the Assessment Task Force survey, colleges were asked about the venues where assessment testing was made available. While it is not surprising that the vast majority of testing is done at the colleges (mathematics: 84.21%; English writing: 84.94%; English reading: 84.92%; ESL: 93.60%), a significant amount of testing is done in the high schools. Of all the assessment testing that takes place in the state, 11.62% of math, 12.15% of English writing, and 12.60% of English reading assessment occur in high schools. Not surprisingly, given the population, the numbers for ESL testing are not as high but still significant at 5.35%.

Given the need for clearer messages to high school students about the academic standards needed to succeed in community colleges, it is encouraging to know that such a significant portion of assessment testing is conducted at the high schools. The need for orientation and counseling services surrounding the assessment process is equally important, and it is to be hoped that
community college counselors and other faculty are able to participate in such assessments. This would be an important follow-up question for future research in this area.

Recommendations

Research supports increased communication with high school students regarding academic preparation for college. With this in mind, the Task Force makes the following recommendation.

- The system should provide the resources to provide increased opportunities for assessment testing in high schools along with information to increase awareness of college expectations.

A Systemwide Uniform, Common Assessment

The understanding of the task force as to why the Board has asked for uniform common assessments in the areas of English, mathematics, and ESL is that the Board’s interest stems largely from two concerns. Currently, colleges expend a significant portion of matriculation budgets on assessment testing, not to mention the matriculation services that support assessment processes. Colleges expend additional resources on the validation of assessment tests and their use as pre-requisites. In addition, the Board has heard that students, who are increasingly moving fluidly between community colleges, are generally subject to retesting at each college they attend. In both cases, resources now devoted to assessment testing, both in terms of money and time, might be redirected to other needy areas if uniform common assessments were in place.

Not surprisingly, considerable resistance to the imposition of a single, uniform common assessment in each subject area was expressed by the constituent groups represented on the Task Force. Local determination of what best supports student success is a deeply ingrained concept in our system. Each college has invested a great deal of time and care in selecting the assessment tests it currently uses, not to mention the time and expense of validating the tests for use with the local population. In some districts, this has led to the development of “homegrown” tests that are specifically tailored to reflect the local curricula and student population. In addition, questions were raised about the ability to validate a statewide-mandated test under current matriculation guidelines.

The topic of common assessment is not limited to the score from an assessment test alone. The topic of “assessment shopping” was raised several times in the Board’s discussion, and simple portability of scores would not eliminate this practice. In order to reduce the attractiveness of “assessment shopping,” placement recommendations would also need to standardized, but this requires standardizing the curriculum among colleges. Under the current legislative principles established by the Board, the Board supports the maintenance of local authority and control in the administration of the colleges. Education Code section §70902(b)(7) clearly puts responsibility for curriculum under the joint responsibility of the local board and the academic senates of the district, a significant impediment to the implementation of a statewide curriculum in English, mathematics, or ESL.
The Number of Assessment Tests Used in the California Community College System

According to MIS data for 2005-2006 (2006-2007 data is not yet available), the colleges use a total of 92 tests. However, upon analysis, it becomes apparent that different sections of the same test are reported separately in this data, and that the number of discrete tests is far lower, under 30.

The Task Force survey provides a more detailed picture of assessment tests used as of Fall 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Writing</th>
<th>English Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuplacer – 37</td>
<td>Accuplacer – 46</td>
<td>MDTP – 42</td>
<td>CELSA – 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass – 22</td>
<td>Compass – 23</td>
<td>Accuplacer – 41</td>
<td>Compass – 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTEP – 15</td>
<td>CTEP – 16</td>
<td>Compass – 19</td>
<td>Accuplacer – 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. The Top 3 Commercial Tests Used in Each Assessment Area (number of colleges)*

In the area of mathematics, 100 colleges reported using a commercial test; eight use a homegrown test; and seven report using some form of self-assessment (colleges could indicate more than one type of test; thus, the total is more than 109). Of the commercial test users, 41 colleges use the College Board’s Accuplacer, 19 use ACT’s Compass, and 42 use CSU’s Mathematics Diagnostic Test Project (MDTP). Five colleges use an additional test aside from these three, and one college uses exclusively a different test. Colleges report offering 233,600 mathematics assessments in Fall 2006 (some students took more than one mathematics assessment, e.g. in algebra and in calculus). One college reports offering no mathematics assessment testing.

In the area of English, 89 colleges report offering assessment testing, and 96 report offering assessment testing in reading.

In the area of English writing, three colleges use a form of self-assessment, 26 use a writing sample, 10 use a homegrown test that is not a writing sample, and 80 use commercially developed tests. Of the commercial test users, 37 use Accuplacer; six use the CCC Assessment and Placement Services (APS), 22 use COMPASS, and 15 use the College Test for English Placement (CTEP). In addition, seven colleges use an additional test instrument not among these four, and four colleges exclusively use tests not among these four. Colleges report offering 176,152 English writing assessments in Fall 2006.

In the area of English reading, 3 colleges use a form of self-assessment, 5 use a homegrown test, and 91 use a commercial test (colleges were able to select more than one answer). Of the commercial test users, 16 colleges use the CTEP; 23 use COMPASS; three use APS; and 46 use Accuplacer; three exclusively use tests not in the top 4; and one uses a different test as an additional test. Colleges report offering 199,628 reading assessments in Fall 2006.

In the area of English as a Second Language, 101 colleges offer assessment testing. Eight use a form of self-assessment, 31 use a writing sample, 14 use a homegrown test that is not a writing sample, and 86 colleges use commercially developed tests. Of those 86, 17 use Accuplacer; 47 use the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA), and 22 use COMPASS. Two colleges exclusively use tests besides these, and one college uses a different test than these three.
as an additional test. Colleges report offering 38,497 ESL assessments in Fall 2006 (some students took more than one assessment, e.g. a writing sample and a commercial test).

From this survey of currently used tests, it is clear that more and more colleges are moving to the use of computerized tests (Accuplacer and COMPASS). Computerized testing automates scoring of tests and also provides flexibility as to when students can take the test, two attractions for assessment administration. Accuplacer and COMPASS are two of the top three tests used in each category.

Brown and Niemi (2007) cite the 94 tests used by the system and the inconsistent message this variation in testing sends high school students in terms of preparation. Only 11 states align high school tests with college preparation requirements. As mentioned above, they recommend making clear to students, even in middle school, what academic expectations are, including placement testing information.

One way of sending a uniform message and generating consistent expectations across community college campuses is to make common the placement testing practices the campuses employ. This might mean determining a limited set of existing assessments to be used, or developing a placement test battery specifically for the community colleges. Such a dramatic shift from existing practices would require involvement at the state level, with the Community College Board of Governors playing a major role in establishing a consistent and coherent placement testing policy. Additional research should be conducted into the alignment of the community college placement tests and other existing placements such as the English Placement Test and the Entry-Level Math Test in use at the other college systems in the state, as well as the alignment between placement tests and the skills actually addressed in the community college classrooms. (p27)

Given the number of recent reports that stress the large number of assessment tests in use in the system, the Task Force was actually surprised by the relatively small number of tests reported on the survey, particularly among the commercial tests. With only three major commercial tests used in each area, there is clearly a commonality that can be exploited to increase portability of test scores between institutions.

Acceptance of Assessment Results between Colleges and Districts

Anecdotal evidence seemed to suggest that few colleges were willing to accept the assessment results of other colleges, from other districts let alone those in the same district. Moore and Shulock (2007) offer one damning example of this disjuncture in one four-college district:

One college will accept all assessments from the other three with the exception of math assessments at one college; another college will accept reading, writing, and math assessments but none in English as a Second Language (ESL). A third will conditionally accept all assessments from all the other three colleges; a fourth will accept no ESL or math assessments from any of its three sister colleges and will accept only raw (not using the results) scores from two of the three sister colleges in reading while accepting no reading assessments from the third sister college.
However, responses to the Task Force survey suggests that much more acceptance of the assessment results of other colleges and districts is taking place than has been suggested anecdotally.

While 12% of the colleges never accept mathematics assessment results from other colleges, 24% of the colleges always accept such results. For English writing, 10.1% always accept results but 14.6% never do. For English reading, equally 13.5% always reject and always accept assessment results from other institutions. Given the wide variations in ESL, we see here the highest percentage of always reject with 40.6% and a lower percentage of always accept at 8.9%. How the colleges accept these results varies.

Of the reasons given for never accepting the assessment results from other colleges, in the area of ESL, most of the colleges cite differences in curriculum. Before an assessment instrument can be used for placement, the instrument must be evaluated for content validity, that is how well the items in the instrument correlate to the subject matter covered in the courses where students will be placed. Given the myriad combinations of ESL courses and the levels of instruction developed specifically for local needs, the commonality of curriculum between colleges, also known as curricular alignment, is low for ESL courses. Hence, the lack of confidence that an assessment instrument used elsewhere will adequately provide the information needed to properly place students into ESL courses. Many people would expect that there would be greater alignment in curriculum in mathematics, and the survey bears this out. While curriculum in ESL is cited as the reason for rejecting assessment results by 82.9%, curriculum was cited in mathematics by only 53.8%. Lack of curricular alignment was cited by 76.9% as a factor in rejecting assessment results in both English reading and writing.

Outside of those who always accept or reject assessment results are the vast majority who accept assessment results under certain conditions: mathematics at 63.9%; English writing at 75.3%; and English reading at 72.9%. Even 50.5% of colleges sometimes accept ESL assessment results.

In mathematics, almost two-thirds of this subset accept the scores if the test is the same, but this does beg the question of why one-third do not. Approximately 58% of these colleges accept the assessment results of other colleges in their districts. Within a few percentage points, the responses are similar for English and ESL.

When results are rejected, lack of curricular alignment is still a major reason (mathematics: 71.0%; English writing: 67.2%; English reading: 71.4%), particularly in ESL with 92.2% citing this issue. Interestingly, difficulty in interpreting raw scores of assessment tests was also high, with all four areas above 77%.

*Use of Other Commonly Offered Tests*

The Task Force also used the survey to ascertain the use of other tests commonly taken by high school students and recent high school graduates. These include Advanced Placement (AP), the International Baccalaureate (IB), the SAT and ACT, and the CSU entry tests for English and
mathematics known respectively as the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry-Level Mathematics (ELM) test.

Of these tests, the AP exams are the most widely used by the community colleges in any fashion. For the most part, the result of an AP exam is used to grant course credit and occasionally unit credit. In this way, the AP exam serves as fulfillment of a degree/certificate/general education requirement or a pre-requisite. A few colleges also use the AP exam as one of the multiple measures used in the assessment process. Overall, however, the AP exam was not designed for and is clearly not used as a means for placement over a range of courses.

The other tests are used with the same frequency as AP exam results as one of the multiple measures. However, in all other respects, these other tests are used far less for any curricular purpose.

Recommendations

While the Task Force was not able to recommend a single common uniform assessment test in any of the areas, it is clear that the field is moving in the direction of uniformity in many respects. As stated above, the technological advantages of using Accuplacer and COMPASS are prompting many colleges to adopt these two tests for all areas. In addition, the MDTP is widely used in mathematics and the CELSA for ESL. As of the writing of this report, the California Community College Assessment Association is looking into the development of a system ESL assessment test, which would be available for use within the system at no cost. If such a test is developed, market forces will undoubtedly prompt serious consideration of its adoption across the state.

It should be noted that staff from Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) at colleges across the state have commented that there are significant accessibility issues with Accuplacer. The High Tech Center Training Unit (HTCTU) is in the process of gathering further information on this issue, but this concern on the part of DSPS staff shows another important consideration when choosing assessment tests.

In looking at the extent to which colleges accept the assessment results from other institutions, the responses were more positive than expected. Such efforts should be encouraged, and as noted previously, the small number of commercial tests used in each area can facilitate this.

Curricular issues appear to be the number one impediment to instituting a common assessment test across the state. More research needs to be done to investigate whether curriculum is intractably individualized at the colleges or whether there are commonalities that can be exploited. The general agreement of the Task Force members is that basic skills and ESL courses are too varied in focus and content to be very promising in such research. However, degree-applicable courses may be a better subject of research given the definitions that exist in Title 5 and the course descriptions that were formerly employed under the Course Articulation Number (CAN) system for transfer courses.
With these considerations in mind, the Task Force makes the following recommendations.

- A statewide system for the sharing of assessment testing data should be established. This system would facilitate the portability of assessment testing data and the intra-institutional use of student assessment testing data.
- Given the limited number of commercial tests used in the system, a comparability table should be developed for the test results from these tests. This effort would facilitate the intra-institutional use of student assessment testing data.
- The system should support the efforts of the California Community College Assessment Association to develop an ESL assessment test available for statewide use.
- The system should support a pilot project which explores the alignment across colleges of course outcomes for Freshman Composition, the course one level below Freshman Composition, and the course commonly known as English 1B/101B as a first step in researching the feasibility of implementing a common assessment.

Concluding Thoughts

There are many issues that the Assessment Task Force was not able to explore. In the course of formulating and administering the survey, participants and interested parties raised issues worthy of further exploration. One of the most vocal groups includes those involved in noncredit. Noncredit has, until recently, been overlooked as a significant pathway to foster student success in higher education. With enhanced noncredit funding afforded through SB361, presentations on the topic to the Board of Governors, and the publication of the Academic Senate paper The Role of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges, the vital role that noncredit plays in academic preparation and as a pathway to degrees, certificates, and transfer, has been highlighted. While limited, matriculation funds are provided specifically for students enrolled in noncredit courses and programs, including in the areas of assessment and orientation. More research is needed to ascertain the status of matriculation services in noncredit and what further support is needed to strengthen this pathway to further higher education.

Several issues raised by the 2006 Matriculation Assessment/Placement Task Force recommendations still need to be addressed. In addition to echoing the need for more attention to noncredit issues, the recommendations include reviewing matriculation regulation, the need for training for matriculation officers, and fostering collaboration between assessment and curriculum development.

The reports cited elsewhere in this report also raise other issues that have not been explored, including the issues of the use of multiple measures, revisiting the process for validation of pre-requisites, how to hire more counselors and matriculation personnel within the restraints of the 50% Law, mandatory placement and timelines for remediation.

Finally, the Board’s own motion raises other issues that still need to be explored, including the relationship of changes in matriculation policy and access and exemption policies. With that in mind, the Task Force concludes its report with the following recommendation.
The Task Force should be continued, with support from the System Office and the Board of Governors, in order to address further assessment issues such as noncredit assessment and placement, validation of prerequisites, multiple measures. The Task Force should identify and prioritize further research to support future recommendations.
Summary of Task Force Recommendations

- The State should fully fund mandatory matriculation services in order to allow colleges to implement exemption policies based on maximizing student success rather than on financial limitations. Matriculation funding should receive annual COLA and growth funding.

- The system should provide the resources to provide increased opportunities for assessment testing in high schools along with information to increase awareness of college expectations.

- A statewide system for the sharing of assessment testing data should be established. This system would facilitate the portability of assessment testing data and the intra-institutional use of student assessment testing data.

- Given the limited number of commercial tests used in the system, a comparability table should be developed for the test results from these tests. This effort would facilitate the intra-institutional use of student assessment testing data.

- The system should support the efforts of the California Community College Assessment Association to develop an ESL assessment test available for statewide use.

- The system should support a pilot project which explores the alignment across colleges of course outcomes for Freshman Composition, the course one level below Freshman Composition, and the course commonly known as English 1B/101B as a first step in researching the feasibility of implementing a common assessment.

- The Task Force should be continued, with support from the System Office and the Board of Governors, in order to address further assessment issues such as noncredit assessment and placement, validation of prerequisites, multiple measures. The Task Force should identify and prioritize further research to support future recommendations.
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Executive Summary

Declining Fortunes
There is growing concern about the declining economic competitiveness of the United States relative to both established and developing nations. A telling indicator of declining fortunes is that this country is doing less well in educating new generations than are many other nations. Countries that are doing better at educating their young people will see rising educational attainment compared to the United States, where educational attainment is declining. As other countries are doing a better job educating young people than is the U.S., other states are doing a better job than is California. California’s rank among states in the educational attainment of the working-age population is slipping.

A second telling indicator is the contrast between access to higher education and completion of college programs. The U.S. is near the top in international comparisons in college participation rates but close to the bottom in completion rates. California is near the bottom of the pack, nationally, in a country that is struggling to keep pace globally, placing 46th among states in the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded per 100 undergraduates enrolled. A state of recent studies has concluded that California will need to increase degree attainment among its own population if it is to meet the need for college educated citizens and workers.

In a 2007 study entitled Strategies for Improving Student Success in Postsecondary Education, Arthur Hauptman suggests that the nation’s lack of college success and inability to close the equity gaps stem from policy priorities and funding systems that favor access over readiness and success. Our study examines whether state policies in California stand in the way of greater student success. We examine finance policy for the California Community Colleges (CCC) in an effort to understand whether policies are well targeted to help the state reverse its declining fortunes or if policy changes are needed. We focus on community colleges because they serve by far the most students and can have the biggest impact on the trends cited above – not because policies for other segments of education are presumed to be satisfactory.

An Expanding Focus: Ensuring Access to Success
The good news is that after decades of state and federal policy attention to increasing access to higher education in this country, there is now considerable focus across the country on improving student success in college. The CCC system has signaled its commitment to student success with a new strategic plan with a goal of “student success and readiness,” an annual conference on student success, a new initiative to increase student success in basic skills, and countless local efforts to increase student success.

The catch is that public policies don’t often support the rhetoric around student success. A commitment to increase student success, no matter how genuine, is not enough if public policies work at cross purposes. If we know that today’s students require intensive support services but we don’t give colleges the resources and the authority to provide those services, we should not expect students to succeed. If we know that heavy work schedules prevent students from giving enough attention to their studies but our policies leave students with insufficient financial aid, we should not expect students to succeed. We should change the policies that impede student success.

Policy barriers can frustrate the best efforts to improve practices at the colleges. Resource constraints are certainly at the root of these frustrations and must be addressed, but whatever the level of funding, policies must be designed deliberately to accomplish their intended purposes. What is needed are resources and policies that ensure that resources are used effectively to promote student success and California’s prospects.
Aligning Policy with State Priorities

Effective state finance policy must reinforce state priorities and provide colleges with the necessary means to meet those priorities. Finance policy is a powerful tool because it sends strong signals about what's important and provides incentives for certain behaviors. But finance policy sends signals whether or not the policies have been explicitly chosen to align with real priorities. The signals embedded in the policies create de facto priorities, which may not be the priorities that policy makers would explicitly embrace. Like many other states, California has no explicit priorities for its higher education system other than the broad tenets of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. That makes it more likely that outcomes are driven by de facto priorities rather than priorities that reflect conscious choices of lawmakers and vital needs of the state.

A 2004 report, Ensuring Access with Quality to California’s Community Colleges, concluded that current community college finance mechanisms provide barriers to success rather than promoting it. It recommended a comprehensive review of finance policies to understand whether policies, collectively, are accomplishing their intended purposes. This report presents the results of such a review. We looked at finance policy, broadly defined to include appropriations, categorical programs, restrictions on the use of funds, and policies on fees and financial aid. We examined the incentives embedded in these policies that influence the actions of institutions and students, who respond rationally to such incentives. Our purpose is to understand whether the policies promote, or undermine, state priorities.

Claiming that colleges and students respond to incentives is only to credit them with being rational, and in no way suggests any lack of commitment to success. To the contrary, faculty and staff have demonstrated a strong commitment to student success through the strategic plan and several ongoing system initiatives. But money matters, especially to the resource-poor community colleges whose faculty and staff must always be concerned with next year's budget simply to survive. In an effort to provide the best education possible, college faculty and staff are sometimes driven to maximize revenues and respond to fiscal incentives – even when those actions may not be best for students. As the bestselling book Freakonomics points out, incentives explain how things are, not how we would like them to be.

Identifying State Priorities

In the absence of official policy objectives for higher education, the analysis draws upon the priorities outlined in pending legislation. SB 325 (Scott) – called “Postsecondary Education: Educational and Economic Goals for California Higher Education” – contains a set of six questions that, together with specific performance indicators and targets, comprise a useful set of state priorities for purposes of this analysis. We adapt these six priorities to a community college focus, and analyze current finance policies to see if they promote or impede achievement of these priorities.

1. Increase the college readiness of incoming students
Some of the most powerful reforms occurring across the country are those that enroll colleges and universities as partners with K-12 to help improve the readiness levels of incoming students. CCC policies can influence college readiness among recent high school graduates as well as adults.

2. Provide broad access to higher education for Californians who seek or need a college credential
Declines in education levels of the population call for increasing the number of educated Californians. Access by those individuals who seek a college credential in order to enter or advance in the state workforce addresses this problem. The CCC is authorized to offer instruction that does not lead to credentials and there is strong community support for that role. But from the perspective of meeting public priorities for social and economic vitality, the mission to award educational credentials (including the provision of prerequisite basic skills) takes precedence.

3. Ensure that community college education is affordable
Affordability must address all costs of attending college, including textbooks, transportation, housing, health care, childcare, and other living expenses. Community college fees account for only five percent of college costs. If college is not affordable, when
considering all of these costs and financial aid, students are forced to work too much for their own good, academically. Making college affordable and reducing excessive work hours will improve student success.

4. Increase completion rates for associate degrees, certificates, and baccalaureate degrees via community college transfer
Success in community college includes accomplishments other than program completion, but the economic prospects for the state are so dim without huge gains in educational attainment among growing populations that a focus on program completion is justified. Across the nation, community college success is defined in terms of degree completion, as evidenced by major national projects to improve student success and the goals set by many states.

5. Meet the needs of the state and regional workforce
Often described as the engine of California’s economy, the community colleges are critical to preparing the workforce. The CCC can sustain that engine in several ways: quality programs that give students the knowledge and skills to succeed in the 21st century workplace; programs that collectively meet the needs of the state, with a particular focus on addressing the shortfalls reported in fields such as nursing, teaching, and science and math professions; and responsiveness to the distinct workforce and training needs of each college’s local region.

6. Ensure the efficient use of public funds invested in higher education
It is important that community college finance policies promote the efficient use of public funds because funding is scarce in relation to the extensive and critical set of missions. Resources are invested efficiently if they are directed to areas of greatest need and achieve the best results possible for a given level of investment.

Finance Policy and Student Success
This is an opportune time for a systematic look at finance policy, with mounting pressures on the CCC to account for increased success, the system’s own commitment to student success, and lawmakers’ growing awareness that community colleges are vitally linked to future economic and social health. The finance reforms enacted in 2006 pursuant to SB 361 have earned broad support for increasing the equity of allocations across districts. This accomplishment could provide a basis on which to build the next stage of reforms that would extend the focus beyond base appropriations to other dimensions of finance policy and from district equity to student success.

As we documented in a policy brief, Rules of the Game, too few CCC students are completing degrees and certificates. Colleges need the capacity – both resources and supportive public policies – to ensure that more students can meet their educational goals. Rules of the Game identified two domains of state policy that impede college efforts to help students succeed. One is enrollment and course-taking patterns that students follow, including the counseling and support they receive in making those decisions. We subsequently issued a detailed report, Beyond the Open Door, that analyzed those policies and offered recommendations for increasing student success. This report addresses the second policy domain highlighted in Rules of the Game – state finance policies that affect how much money the colleges have, how they may use those funds, and how student enrollment is supported through fees and financial aid.

State appropriations per full-time student at the CCC are less than 60 percent of that for students at the California State University (CSU) and less than one-third of that of students at the University of California (UC). When fee revenues are accounted for, the revenue differential is vastly magnified because the CCC collect very little student fee revenue compared to the four-year institutions. Strict comparisons are hard to interpret in view of the different missions assigned to each segment and the inability to compare expenditures for undergraduate students. But the large remedial mission performed by community colleges is more expensive than has typically been recognized in community college funding levels across the nation. Community
college students generally require considerable institutional resources if they are to succeed.

In view of the state's continuing structural budget deficit, there are unlikely to be more than incremental gains in per-student funding in the near future. This will continue to put a premium on the effective use of limited resources. This report, through a systematic review of finance policies, seeks to determine whether the people of California are, as the title of this report suggests is possible, investing in success.

**Policy Audit Findings**

The report includes extensive descriptions and analyses of the complex realm of community college finance policy. For descriptions of the policies and a full analysis, the reader will have to consult the full report.

**Proposition 98** creates a disincentive for cooperation between K-12 and CCC on college readiness reform and fails to direct funding toward the greatest need with respect to enrollment growth trends within each sector.

**Base funding policies** create pressures to maximize early term enrollments but give no financial incentive to improve outcomes such as persistence, course completion, degree completion, or student learning. They provide no incentive to enroll students (e.g., degree seeking, low-income, underserved) who would increase overall educational attainment levels in the state. Some of the means to increase enrollment, such as allowing late registration and minimizing course prerequisites, work against student completion. There are disincentives to invest in high cost programs.

**Enrollment growth policies** create incentives for districts to expand enrollment, but only up to a specified cap. High-growth districts have little means to respond to excess enrollment, which could impede access. Low-growth districts are encouraged to recruit students. The method for allocating district caps can create a disconnect between actual need and authorized enrollments.

**Categorical funding** is implemented, is a flawed mechanism for addressing priorities. In a system of local and state-level governance, categorical funding could potentially steer districts toward meeting high priority state goals. However, there is no apparent logic as to which programs receive categorical funding, as it is used to support core functions such as student advising and compensation for part-time faculty. The stated goals of the categorical programs are not always promoted by the funding mechanisms. Categorical programs impose unnecessarily high administrative costs on colleges. By segmenting a college budget into various protected pieces, categorical funding prevents colleges from developing college-wide priorities for the allocation of resources.

**Restrictions on the use of funds** deprive college leaders of flexibility and authority they need to manage their institutions. Community colleges are locally governed in order to meet the diverse needs of the state's communities. Having one-size-fits-all requirements for how colleges can spend their funds, who they can hire, and for how long discounts the local variations and the ability of college leaders to know how best to manage their funds.

**Fee policies** are principally about keeping fees low to promote access. Low fees promote high rates of college participation among broad populations, many of whom never complete an academic credential or seek to complete one. Although low fees are largely responsible for per-student funding being below the national average, there is virtually no stakeholder support for increasing fees. College funding derives largely from FTES so any action that could reduce enrollment is opposed. In addition, fee revenue is deducted from state funding entitlements so it is not treated or viewed as a potential source of additional revenue that could increase access and success.

**Financial aid** in the form of waived fees and Cal Grants reduce financial barriers to access, and the Cal Grant program contains some incentives for students to prepare and perform academically. The fee waiver program has no incentives for students to prepare for college or make academic progress once enrolled. The Cal Grant award has declined severely in purchasing power to the point where students face serious affordability problems, even with an award. With the emphasis on keeping fees low as the primary means to make college affordable, policy has given insufficient attention to the larger costs of college.
### Table ES-1
Summary of Policy Alignment with Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Readiness</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 58</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apportionments</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categoricals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Administration</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure restrictions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% / 25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% part time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-semester temporary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low fees</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue offset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fee non-credit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit campus fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Aid:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG waivers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Grant</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**  
+ indicates that the policy promotes the priority  
- indicates that the policy fails to promote, or works at cross purposes to, the priority
As a result, community college students do not get all the financial aid for which they are eligible. Lack of aid causes students to work more than necessary, which is a serious factor in their lack of success.

**Policies Undermine State Priorities**

Table ES-1 summarizes the analysis of the policies with respect to the six priorities. A "+" indicates that the policy promotes the priority; a "-" indicates that the policy fails to promote, or works at cross purposes to, the priority. This summary does not reflect the different magnitudes of the effect of each policy, but it does reveal a substantial misalignment between policies and priorities. The greatest alignment is with the access priority, but even those policies do little to encourage access by the growing numbers of under-served Californians — precisely those individuals whose education is most likely to stem the decline in educational attainment and workforce quality.

The analysis of policy impact is predicated on the proposition that people, both individually and as institutional representatives, respond to incentives. An assertion that faculty, staff, and students respond to fiscal incentives entails no judgments about their values. When enrollment-driven funding leads colleges to allow late registration beyond what they know is good for student success, it is not because colleges care little about student success. They are playing by the rules of the game that have been established for them as they strive for financial survival. If a student continues for several terms without seeing a counselor and makes no forward progress toward her goals, it is not because she doesn’t care about her future but likely because the wait to see a counselor is too long and there is no need to make forward academic progress in order to renew her fee waiver.

**Policies Do Not Provide Colleges the Means to Fulfill their Missions**

The CCC is expected to fulfill a broad and costly set of missions at a fraction of the cost of universities. Experts have warned against ignoring capacity issues when developing policies to promote college access. Access is of little value to students if colleges cannot accommodate them and serve them effectively. Ensuring that colleges have the means to fulfill their missions goes beyond funding levels and includes the freedom to use resources — whatever their level — most effectively. This requires a set of policies that do not work at cross purposes to system and student effectiveness. It requires that colleges have the decision-making authority to direct resources to where they are most needed.

Our analysis has revealed a very strong emphasis on policies that stimulate enrollment without an equivalent policy focus on getting the CCC system the resources and decision-making authority it needs to serve these large numbers of students effectively. The funding available to the system is determined more by K-12 enrollments than by community college enrollment demand and total funding is artificially capped by formula. There is very little fee revenue available to the system and that which is collected does not augment college budgets. The distribution of core and targeted funds to districts places other factors before the needs of students and communities. Regulatory restrictions seriously impede local discretion to make the best use of resources.

**Affordability Policy is Needed**

The long-standing assumption that keeping fees low (and waiving them for needy students) will ensure affordable community colleges has proven misguided. There is a serious affordability problem in the CCC that has little to do with fees. A comprehensive affordability policy must be developed to (1) address the full costs of college attendance, (2) take full advantage of federal grant and loan programs, (3) increase the purchasing power of Cal Grants, (4) establish an institutional aid program in the CCC similar to the State University Grant Program and the University of California Grant Program, and (5) consider whether higher fees for non-needy students could increase access and success by augmenting state appropriations with much-needed revenues.

Those who oppose fee increases express genuine concerns that any fee increase will reduce access among the at-risk and poor students who depend on the community colleges for a secure future. But no one who cares about the economic and civic health of the state wants to deprive needy Californians of an education. The question is whether access for those individuals can be protected in such a way that does not deprive the institution of needed resources.
Proponents of no- or low-fee community colleges would like to see the state budget reflect different policy choices. But the same demographic changes that have shaped today's community college are increasing the competition for state funds -- for an array of health and social services required by the growing numbers of immigrants and disadvantaged populations. In view of these competing priorities and the tax-limited environment in which we live, it may be that current fee policies can be maintained only at the expense of inadequate funding for the community colleges to serve students.

Not all community college students are low-income. By design, a full two-thirds of California high school graduates are ineligible for direct enrollment in UC or CSU and are directed to community colleges if they attend in-state public institutions and many others choose to attend a community college for reasons of convenience and access to quality teachers and programs. The median household income of dependent CCC students is similar to that of all California households. This suggests that many CCC students would not be financially disadvantaged by a modest increase in fees. It is time to take a fresh look at the relationship among fees, financial aid, state support and access to see if there are options other than waiting for taxpayers' and lawmakers' priorities to change.

Directions for Reform
Various groups have identified problems with CCC funding mechanisms in recent years, including the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, whose working group identified in 2004 some of the same problems that our research has confirmed, such as under-funding with respect to mission, extensive bureaucratic restrictions, and limited district flexibility to raise additional revenue. Independently, the CCC system convened a working group of finance experts that recommended changes that led to the enactment of important reforms, but the reforms did not address some of the broader issues raised by others and confirmed here.

Inspired by national policy experts and organizations, there is a great deal of activity across the country in exploring or implementing new approaches to finance policy to help accomplish state priorities. In many cases these new directions recognize that finance policies often mistakenly steer people in ineffective directions. We have categorized these approaches by (1) whether they aim to influence the behavior of colleges or students and (2) which of the six proposed priorities they address, and we list them in the full report. It is our intention to encourage conversations in California about how the state might adapt some of these ideas to our circumstances and design fair and sensible budgeting systems that can help college faculty and staff increase student success.

Investing in Success
The new directions in policy reform show that investing in success applies to all aspects of finance policy -- not only to the way that annual budgets are allocated to colleges. It applies to eligibility requirements for financial aid, fee policy, flexibility in the use of resources, differential funding for higher cost programs and services, faculty salaries, and collaborative efforts between colleges and high schools. A variety of strategies along these lines might be used to improve student success. They are not typically thought of in the context of finance policy reform, but they should be.

Policies that affect basic college allocations create the most powerful incentives because they affect the distribution of core funding. If Californians are to invest wisely in the success of community college students, it is vital that funding mechanisms be structured to include incentives for achieving positive outcomes. The question, which continues to perplex American higher education, is how best to incorporate measures of success into funding decisions.

Performance funding has largely failed across American higher education and has a deservedly bad reputation among educators. The conventional wisdom behind performance funding is fundamentally flawed because it assumes that a very small pot of funds set aside to reward performance after the fact is going to change the nature of the enterprise. When those changes don't result, the performance fund is typically deemed expendable -- usually after a short trial period, such as occurred with the Partnership for Excellence program (PFE) in the community colleges.
There is a better approach, which we call investing in success. The fundamental difference is that investing in success acknowledges that improving performance is not an add-on responsibility. It is an ongoing and costly undertaking and should be institutionalized into the basic funding formula so as to provide a stable and significant funding source. Investing in success changes the incentives built into core funding while performance funding leaves the current incentives in place and sets up a small categorical program to fund performance. Funds earned under an investing in success model are, by definition, part of a college’s base funding, while funds earned under traditional performance budgeting approaches are bonuses that may or may not last.

Investing in success works by re-conceptualizing the workload that state funding covers through the basic allocation. Workload is currently defined as 3rd week enrollment and colleges are funded to serve it. Additional workload factors could be added, such as teaching students for a full term, serving financially disadvantaged students, guiding students through basic skills, enrolling students in specified programs, or producing certificates and degrees. These are just a few of the many possibilities for redefining workload to align funding with priorities. The full report includes a hypothetical illustration of how this model works and how the inclusion of different performance-related workload factors can alter a college’s funding level without the setting of arbitrary targets and the imposition of rewards or penalties.

Under this approach, the state’s investment in success increases each year as workload growth funds are provided to the system. This ensures that college progress is not funded at the expense of other colleges. Investing in success has the additional advantages over traditional performance funding of sending the message that performance is something to be institutionalized – not pursued at the margins and at some times but not others.

Change in finance policies will not come easily. There are powerful political interests behind the current policies. But there is too much at stake for the future to acquiesce to policies that place the needs of stakeholder groups ahead of the needs of students and California’s economic future. It is essential to find finance mechanisms that will ensure that California invests enough in its community college system and invests in success.
El Camino student sexually attacked outside the gym

Man who savagely assaulted woman, 20, at knifepoint wore a ski mask and black clothing, police say.

By Larry Altman
Staff Writer

A man dressed in black clothing and a ski mask accosted a 20-year-old student at knifepoint on the El Camino College campus and sexually assaulted her, police said Wednesday.

The assailant ran after the Tuesday night attack outside the women's gym, leaving his victim crying on the ground. Police said she dialed 911 to summon help. A campus public safety officer found her in tears.

"The commission of the crime is so savage, we just think this guy is perhaps a habitual offender," said El Camino College Interim Police Chief Steve Port.

The man somehow committed the crime undetected on a 6-foot-wide path on the west side of the gym. The attack occurred at 7 p.m., a busy time on campus, so police believe someone might have seen something that can help investigators, Port said.

The assailant was described as 5 feet 8 inches tall, in his 20s, wearing black sweat pants, a hooded sweat jacket and ski mask, and one dark-colored glove.

His race was unknown.

Port said officers are looking for witnesses, particularly anyone walking through the campus who saw the man in black before he put the ski mask on.

"He could have been in some degree of lesser disguise prior to the crime," Port said.

Port, who was formerly chief of police in Hawthorne, spoke to the victim's father Wednesday. She spent Tuesday night in the hospital but was home the next day.

Detectives will speak to her in the next few days and ask her to meet with a sketch artist. Although the attacker's face was covered, police hope the artist can extract something from the woman's memory to create a drawing, Port said.
Police officers, meanwhile, increased their presence on campus and spread word of the attack through e-mails to all students and employees. They also posted fliers around campus.

Port said police did not want to create hysteria, but detectives needed to scout for witnesses and students had to be cautioned.

Police urged students to be aware of their surroundings, walk with friends, keep their keys in their hands while walking to their cars, and remember that they can be distracted by MP3 players and cell phones.

Officers encouraged students to learn the location of "code blue" emergency telephones situated around the campus and to use a police shuttle service from

6 to 10:30 p.m.

Police suggested that night students and faculty park in busy areas so groups can walk together to their cars after dark.

larry.altman@dailybreeze.com

HOW TO HELP

Anyone with information about the crime is asked to call campus police at 310-660-3100.
Updated Facilities Master Plan Approved

The El Camino College Board of Trustees recently approved an updated Facilities Master Plan that will enable us to complete renovation projects while dealing with substantial construction cost increases.

The plan covers projects scheduled through the next five years. However, the plan relies upon an anticipated $37 million in new, but not yet confirmed, state funding.

Due to escalating construction costs, our current Facilities Master Plan is substantially under funded. Estimates show that the original $460 million plan would now cost $733 million to implement. State funding has offset some funding shortfalls - in fact, a proposal for El Camino College’s Math Building renovation/conversion and the Student Services/Activities replacement/renovation met with positive initial reviews from the state.

Master plan revisions include:
- **Increase budgets** to complete Bookstore renovation, new parking structure and infrastructure improvements.
- **Construct a new building** at the Business Division area to accommodate additional space for the Mathematics Division, creating a new Mathematics and Business Building (estimated construction 2009).
- **Redesign the north entrance** of campus with additional parking by removing the Technical Arts Building (estimated construction 2012).
- **Use anticipated state funding** to renovate the current Math and Computer Science Building, which will be converted for Industry and Technology programs (estimated construction 2011).

**Postpone construction** of the Student Services and Activities Building replacement until state funds can be secured (estimated construction 2012).

Budget adjustments include the shifting of projected contingency funds, allocating currently unbudgeted interest income, shifting uncommitted equipment/site purchases, and reallocating surplus funds from projects that were completed under budget.

For more information on the revised Facilities Master Plan, click on this link: [http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/facilities/docs/FacilitiesMapUpdate_Oct2007.pdf](http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/facilities/docs/FacilitiesMapUpdate_Oct2007.pdf) for a map detailing the plan.

Accreditation Update

All nine self-study standards will be posted to **MyECC** - look for them in the "Accreditation Self Study" link under “Planning Documents” in the “Documents” tab. All are available for public review and comment - we encourage feedback and input.

Remember - all El Camino College employees and students are welcome to join any of the nine standard committees. Many participants have said the process is interesting and offers an opportunity to gain an appreciation of the scope of work performed outside their typical area of expertise.

Open Forum sessions are being set up for next week at both campuses. Feedback is welcome by e-mail or in person at...
all of the forums. Electronic feedback can be sent to Susan Dever sdever@elcamino.edu or Arvid Spor aspor@elcamino.edu.

Accreditation Timeline

November 6-8
Open Forums - campus community feedback

November 15
Second draft comments referred to respective standard committees

November 30
Standard co-chairs incorporate second draft comments

November/December
Executive committee review

December/February
Editor prepares final draft

March 3
Final draft to College Council for review and discussion

April 21
Board of Trustees - first reading

May 19
Board of Trustees - second reading/projected approval

June
Print bound copies of the self study and mail to accrediting commission

October
Accreditation team visit

Since then, El Camino College has worked with representatives from the Compton campus to assist with its recovery and full accreditation as a two-year public college, a process that is expected to take five to eight years.

Planning Software
We are in the process of adapting new software for planning purposes. The software is “Plan Builder,” and will assist the college not only with planning and budgets, but also with program review and accreditation - specifically SLOs. Look for more information in the future.

Campaigning on Campus
Please remember that it is illegal to use public funds for promoting political campaigns of any kind. As outlined in El Camino College Board Policy 7370 and California Education Code Section 7054, employees cannot use district services, supplies or equipment to urge the passage or defeat of any ballot measure or candidate for office.

This policy prohibits political activity during an employee’s working hours, but does not prohibit an employee from urging the support or defeat of a ballot measure or candidate during non-working time.

Chancellor Report
President Fallo recently met with California Community Colleges Chancellor Diane Woodruff to provide updates and information regarding the agreement with El Camino College Compton Center.

The Memorandum of Understanding will need to be revisited, with possible revisions necessary.

It has been more than a year since El Camino College entered into an agreement to provide educational and necessary support services to residents of the Compton Community College District.

CAMPUS CALENDAR

November
6  Homecoming Rally
8   Salute to Veterans Event
9-11 The HOT’L Baltimore
10  Homecoming Football
    Game/Dance
12  Veteran’s Day Holiday
    (campus closed)
16  Last Day to Drop with a “W”
18  ECC Dance Band
22-25 Thanksgiving Break
    (campus closed)
30  ICC Children’s Holiday Party
November 2007 Federal Update

White House

H.R 3043 Labor-HHHS-Education Appropriations measure

Today, the White House announced the veto of the $606 billion education appropriations bill, noting it is “loaded with 2,000 earmarks,” which President Bush wants stripped from the bill. Rep. David Obey, the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, immediately responded: "This is a bipartisan bill supported by over 50 Republicans...there has been virtually no criticism of its contents. It is clear the only reason the president vetoed this bill is pure politics.” However, in light of the final vote falling just short of the 2/3 majority needed for a veto override, Rep. Obey had last week suggested that resolution might reside in pulling out all earmarks, bringing the costs closer to the President’s January proposal.

The President’s budget sought almost $4 billion in cuts, and this measure added $10 billion to Bush's proposal for the 2008 spending measure. H.R. 3043 includes a 20 percent increase over Bush’s request for job training programs; $1.4 billion more than Bush’s request for health research at the National Institutes of Health, a 5 percent increase and among other spending provisions, $63.6 billion for the Education Department, a 5 percent increase over 2007 spending and 8 percent more than in the President’s budget.

A Continuing Resolution was passed last Friday that extends spending for agencies at the 2007 level to December 15.

Congress

The “mark-up” for this HEA Reauthorization measure is scheduled for November 14 at 10:15 a.m. (EST) in room 2175 Rayburn H.O.B. This 747-page proposal contains almost 40 new programs beyond that of the Senate measure (S. 1642) introduced this summer. Much of the discussion will focus on accountability provisions pertaining to reporting requirements regarding college costs. It is expected there will be extended negotiations over the measures to resolve the differences. Should the debate continue into 2008, members will have until March 1 to come to agreement; otherwise, another extension will be needed, by then intruding on campaign season.

Anne Mckinney
Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Federal Relations
CCC Chancellor’s Office
Daniel Weintraub: Californians worried about rising cost of college

By Daniel Weintraub -

Published 12:00 am PDT Thursday, November 1, 2007
Story appeared in EDITORIALS section, Page B7

Californians place a higher value on a college education than do Americans from other states, but many also have a sense that their children will not be accepted to a university or be able to afford it even if they are invited to enroll, according to a new statewide survey to be released today.

The poll, by the Public Policy Institute of California, reveals an angst among the state's adults, who believe that higher education is a key to personal wellbeing and the state's economy but say that getting a college education is more difficult than it was ten years ago.

The good news is that at least some of those fears might be misplaced.

While the cost of a college education has been steadily increasing, state data show that California high school graduates are attending public colleges or universities here in record numbers and at rates about equal to a decade ago.

"There is a real disconnect here," said Mark Baldassare, president of the policy institute and director of the poll. "Parents overwhelmingly think college is necessary for success, want their own child to go to college, are clearly worried about being able to afford college, yet don't -- or can't -- save at the rate they think they should." The survey, based on interviews with 2,503 California adults between Oct. 10 and Oct. 23, has a margin of error of plus or minus two percentage points.

Californians, the poll found, believe more in the value of higher education than do Americans elsewhere. Here, 64 percent of adults say college is "necessary for a person to be successful in today's work world," while 34 percent agreed that "there are many ways to succeed" without a college education. A survey conducted earlier this year by Public Agenda, Baldassare said, found that adults nationwide were evenly divided on the same question, with 50 percent saying a college education was necessary to succeed and 49 percent saying it was not.

One factor driving California's numbers up appears to be the state's ethnic diversity, because minorities are more inclined than whites to see higher education as the route to success. Latinos rated a college education the highest, with 79 percent saying it was necessary to succeed. Asians were next at 72 percent, followed by blacks at 68 percent and whites at 55 percent. Immigrants were more likely than native-born Americans to value higher education, with 81 percent of
foreign-born adults saying a college education was necessary and 57 percent of U.S.-born adults making that assessment.

But Californians are also worried about the increasing cost of higher education and what that means about the opportunity of qualified students to attend college.

Only one in three adults said they thought the "vast majority" of qualified students had the opportunity to move on, while 65 percent said they did not. Sixty-six percent said they thought the price of college kept qualified and motivated students from attending. Fifty-six percent of adults believe that getting a college education is more difficult than it was 10 years ago, and 75 percent of parents are at least somewhat worried about being able to afford college for their youngest child.

Those concerns no doubt reflect what Californians know about the rising cost of attending college here. Since 1990, the cost of tuition and fees at the University of California and the California State University system has climbed by 350 percent, while the general cost of living has increased during that time by 44 percent and personal income in California has grown 70 percent.

Despite those higher costs, however, California high school graduates continue to move on to college in large numbers. Since 1996, the number of Californians attending higher education has increased by a quarter-million, to about 2.4 million altogether.

According to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, about 47 percent of the state's high school graduates enrolled in a California public university or college in 2006, compared with 48.5 percent in 1996. That number dipped in the late 1990s, when the booming economy increased opportunities outside of college and the passage of Proposition 209, which banned racial and gender preferences in higher education, was blamed for pushing minority applicants to other states. But the participation rate bottomed out at 42.5 percent of high school graduates in 2003 and has been climbing since.

Participation rates for Latinos are about the same as they were 10 years ago, with 44 percent of Latino high school graduates going on to a California college or university, even as the raw number of Latino graduates has soared. For blacks, meanwhile, about 48 percent of graduates attended college in 2006, and for Asian-Americans the rate was about 69 percent. The only major ethnic group to see a significant drop in its college-going rate since 1996 was whites, with 41 percent of high school graduates going on to a California school in 2006 compared with 45 percent 10 years ago and 51 percent in 1986.

The bottom line: Californians value higher education and are understandably concerned about its accessibility. But the reality might not be as bad as they fear.
Dan Walters: Governor's desertion haunts him

By Dan Walters - dwalters@sacbee.com

Published 12:00 am PST Friday, November 9, 2007

If Arnold Schwarzenegger is looking for someone to blame for the state's worsening budget crisis – one he inherited from predecessor Gray Davis and promised to solve – he can look in the nearest mirror.

Schwarzenegger's own bean counters, the Legislature's budget office, a few curmudgeonly legislators and some in the media repeatedly warned Schwarzenegger that failing to balance the budget during the first three years of his governorship, when the economy and revenues were soaring, would result in a fiscal cataclysm when the economy cooled.

The governor made a few fitful attempts to bring the budget under control, although he exacerbated the problem immensely by reinstating a politically popular, if fiscally unsound, reduction in the taxes on cars. A couple of years ago, however, after his budget control measures were shot down by voters, Schwarzenegger deserted the budget battle and took up more popular causes, such as global warming. Figuratively, he crossed his fingers and hoped that the good times would carry him through his second term without facing the fundamental disconnect between income and outgo.

Well, his luck is running out. Thanks largely to the collapse of the housing market, the state's economy is flattening and revenues are running behind projections, while some of the gimmicks that had been used to narrow the deficit on paper are vanishing. What had been projected to be a $6 billion operating deficit for the 2008-09 fiscal year – no small sum -- has now ballooned into the $10 billion range that this column suggested a few weeks ago.

Yes, the Legislature was complicit in this dereliction of the state's single most important duty – prudent financial management – but it was Schwarzenegger who promised voters in 2003, as they cast out Davis, that he'd clean up "crazy deficit spending," and he has failed utterly.

General fund spending has skyrocketed by 44 percent during his governorship, reaching the levels that his first budget director, Donna Arduin, predicted four years ago. The only thing that prevented the crisis from erupting earlier is that revenues were, for several years, much stronger than Arduin and others had predicted. That gave Schwarzenegger and the Legislature an opportunity to bring the budget into balance without abrupt impacts, but they didn't do it. Instead, they spent every extra dollar and then some.
Meanwhile, Schwarzenegger bragged about not raising taxes and urged voters to approve tens of billions of new infrastructure bonds on the assumption that the budget woes would be resolved, freeing up enough money to repay the loans as needed.

It would be difficult to conclude that Schwarzenegger has been any more diligent about his fiscal responsibilities than Davis. At least Davis was willing, in the final days of his ill-starred governorship, to bite the bullet on increasing revenues; to date, Schwarzenegger is still in denial about both sides of the ledger.

Fundamentally, the state budget is no different from a family budget. One projects revenues and then fits spending into the total, or finds some way to increase income. Just as living on credit cards is eventually ruinous to a family, so the state cannot continue to run deficits forever and paper them over with Enronlike gimmicks.

If Schwarzenegger is the leader he proclaims to be, he'll fess up to the state's precarious fiscal situation, tell Californians the harsh truth about what spending cuts and/or revenue increases would be necessary to close the gap— not just next year but permanently — and then hammer the Legislature to swallow the ill-tasting medicine needed to cure the disease.

If he's not capable of doing that, then he's the "girlie man" he once accused legislators of being. His governorship, despite all the hype, will have been an utter failure.
Sacbee.com

Dan Walters: Big talk, few fixes for schools

By Dan Walters

Published 12:00 am PST Wednesday, November 14, 2007

Were words alone – sheer verbiage – powerful enough to fix California's huge and hugely troubled education system, the problem would have been resolved years ago.

Scarcely a week passes without some new policy conference, legislative hearing, academic study, blue ribbon commission or other verbal venue devoted to analyzing California's educational conundrum and proposing solutions.

This year has been especially productive – if that's the correct term – beginning with a weighty, 23-part study of California's 6 million-student public school system financed by some well-meaning foundations and overseen by Stanford University. It said many things, but was short on definitive conclusions.

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger proclaimed that 2008 would be the "year of education" – presuming, apparently, that he would be successful in his vow that 2007 would be the year that California's health care crisis was resolved. And he appointed a Committee on Education Excellence, headed by renowned educator Ted Mitchell, to draft his own school reform program.

Not to be outdone, as it were, a Mountain View-based educational think tank called EdSource sponsored a conference in Sacramento last month at which 47 papers on fixing California schools were presented.

On Tuesday, meanwhile, Jack O'Connell, the state superintendent of schools, opened a two-day "Achievement Gap Summit" that drew some 4,000 educators to Sacramento, focusing on the chronic gaps between white and Asian American students on one hand and Latino and African American kids on the other, and promising to add a few million more words to an already staggering inventory.

In anticipation of O'Connell's event, two University of California-affiliated think tanks released a massive report last week that charts the achievement gap and suggests reasons for its persistence, regardless of income levels, including a disparity of educational resources.

More words are on the way, because Schwarzenegger's commission has completed its draft report, although the governor is sitting on it. Mitchell, however, gave a preview to the EdSource conference last month, including a proposed overhaul of school financing that would do away with many of the "categorical aids" that supposedly target money to specific learning problems and refocus the money on the most troublesome schools and kids.
"We are looking at ways to reduce categorical programs," Mitchell said, according to Education Week. "We are looking very hard at weighting systems around the country."

If this account of educational verbiage sounds a little jaded, it's because California's schools, at least as measured by such things as test scores and high school dropout rates, have been deteriorating for several decades despite countless studies and programs that were supposed to fix things.

We - via our politicians and education leaders - flit from nostrum to panacea, from smaller class sizes to high school exit exams, while refusing to broach such taboo subjects as union contracts that make it difficult to assign the most experienced teachers to the most difficult schools and students. The educational establishment, meanwhile, monotonously chants that any academic improvement must begin with massive increases in school financing that, in the absence of some immense tax increase, are not in the cards.

While those participating in O'Connell's conference and other forums float what-if? scenarios, the more immediate reality is that the state budget faces at least a $10 billion deficit next year and the school community is bracing for a potential cutback in its constitutional floor of financing from Sacramento. In light of that, the "year of education" may be postponed indefinitely.
Governor should reconsider sales tax hike as worthwhile idea on funding healthcare
October 15, 2007

SACRAMENTO — Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's eyes always have been bigger than the state's wallet when it comes to healthcare expansion. It's the main reason why he and the Legislature can't agree on a plan to insure every Californian.

How do you pay for it? Especially when the state is looking at a projected budget deficit for next year that grows by the week. It's now up to $8.6 billion, largely because of the housing slump. The tab for Schwarzenegger's healthcare plan is up to $14 billion after having started at $12 billion in January.

The governor rolled out a slightly new version last week, discarding the most recent idea for helping to finance the ambitious program: a sales tax increase.

Too bad. A sales tax hike to pay for healthcare reform might have half a chance of winning voter approval, according to a new poll by the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State.

In the statewide survey, 400 frequent voters were asked: "Would you vote for or against a proposal to increase the state sales tax by one cent per dollar to help pay for medical insurance for all Californians?"

The results: 52% for, 38% against.

Not surprisingly, voters who are least likely to have insurance -- the young, the poor, non-whites, singles -- are among the biggest fans of raising the sales tax to pay for healthcare.

Women (57%) support it much more than do men (43%). Retired people are basically split; presumably most already are covered by Medicare and many oppose any tax hike because they're on fixed incomes.

Nearly two-thirds of Democratic voters favor it. Only 38% of Republicans do.

Zero percent of Republican legislators support any form of tax increase. That's why Schwarzenegger and Democratic lawmakers are planning to bypass the GOP and place a healthcare financing initiative -- if they can negotiate one -- on the November 2008 ballot.

A sales tax hike, says San Jose State polling director Philip J. Trounstine, would "have a shot. With the right kind of campaign, they might be able to pull it off."

Veteran political consultant Darry Sragow agrees.
In recent years, Sragow says, surveys have shown that voters will support a tax increase -- preferably a sales tax hike -- that's dedicated to healthcare, especially for children and the poor.

A strategist for Democratic legislators, who asked not to be identified, isn't as optimistic: "It's not impossible, but it's very hard."

The idea of partially financing healthcare reform with the sales tax came from business lobbies -- grocers, retailers, restaurateurs -- leery of possibly stiff employer taxes.

Schwarzenegger tacitly embraced the idea, although not publicly, but Democrats have resisted.

Why, Democrats reason, should they stick their necks out for a consumer tax when Republicans won't?

"It puts Democrats in a vulnerable place," says Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez (D-Los Angeles), "while Republicans stand on the sidelines."

Moreover, he adds, the sales tax is "somewhat regressive," hitting low-income people the hardest.

Of course, the uninsured working poor would be among the biggest beneficiaries of healthcare expansion.

Hospitals have agreed to pay 4% of their revenue into a healthcare financing kitty, persuaded they'd get more in return from increased Medi-Cal reimbursements.

The big fight between Schwarzenegger and Democratic leaders is over how much employers should kick in if they don't already provide medical insurance for their workers. Schwarzenegger's revised proposal charges companies a sliding-scale fee of from 2% to 4% based on payrolls exceeding $100,000.

"He's letting employers off the hook," contends Núñez, who has proposed a 7.5% fee and vows: "I'm not going much below that."

Employers that do provide medical insurance, Núñez says, pay an average 13.5% of payroll.

In pushing aside thoughts of a sales tax hike, Schwarzenegger last week proposed a scheme that smacks of gimmickry: Leasing out the California Lottery and generating $2 billion a year for healthcare.

The governor figures a private outfit could produce more lottery ticket sales than state bureaucrats can.

Basically, he'd pay for healthcare by promoting gambling addiction.

The lottery was sold to voters in 1984 as a means of helping to finance public schools. "Many people feel they were snookered," Sragow says. "They were told the lottery would pay for
education and it hasn't even come close."

Education receives roughly $1.1 billion annually from state lottery winnings. Under Schwarzenegger's plan, it no longer would. But the same amount -- the governor promises -- would come from the strapped state general fund, replenished with lottery lease money.

"It appears to me to be a shell game," says state Supt. of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell. "I want quality healthcare, but it has to be real. The sales tax is a stable, predictable revenue source."

Lottery revenue is a gamble.

John Handley, lobbyist for the California Independent Grocers Assn., which endorsed the sales tax hike, sits on the lottery advisory board.

"I'd prefer a one-cent sales tax over messing around with the lottery," he says. "It's a much broader base.

"The lottery was set up to be state-run and it ought to stay that way. It's run pretty efficiently."

Núñez says he'll keep an open mind about leasing the lottery. But, privately, legislators say the idea's going nowhere.

Let's hope. If Schwarzenegger wants to pad the state wallet for healthcare, he should use real dollars, not funny money.
OAKLAND
Governor vetoes bill on school governance

Tyche Hendricks, Chronicle Staff Writer
Sunday, October 14, 2007

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger vetoed a bill Saturday that would have returned control of the Oakland Unified School District to the local school board, after four years in which the district has been managed by the state superintendent of public instruction.

In his veto message for AB45, a bill by Assemblyman Sandre Swanson, D-Alameda, the governor said he supports returning the district to local governance "when it is appropriate to do so." But he said the pace at which the bill sought to restore local authority "may surpass the pace at which the state administrator can imbed sustainable reforms."

"In the interest of the educational well-being of the students," Schwarzenegger concluded, "it is well worth investing the time to allow the (state schools superintendent) to finish the work that has already begun."

Oakland school board members had been especially eager for a return to local control since the abrupt resignation last month of state-appointed administrator Kimberly Statham. She was the second state steward since 2003, when the board had to take a $100 million bailout loan and relinquish control to the state.

The district is being managed on an interim basis by Vincent Matthews, who was Statham's chief of staff, while the state conducts a national search for a new administrator.

The administrator's job is to run the district while returning it to fiscal solvency. But in September, Statham said Oakland still owes $90 million of the state loan and is operating with a $4.7 million deficit this year. She said she expected the district's budget to be in balance next year.

In a statement Saturday, Swanson said he was upbeat despite the governor's veto because of progress made toward local control since the bill's introduction last year. Among the accomplishments he cited were: transferring authority for community relations back to
the school board, funding a new state fiscal review of the district and emphasizing the importance of parental involvement in educational decision-making.

"I will continue to engage the state and district stakeholders in a partnership to ensure the educational environment in the district is healthy and positive for children," Swanson said.
Peter Schrag: California school fixes ahead: Proceed with caution

By Peter Schrag -
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Brace yourself: California is about to get another "year of education." It will almost inevitably come with high-decibel laments about the dismal performance of California schools, excessive expectations about all the things schools can do and Bulfinch-size volumes of myths about how great they once were.

There'll be lots of modish talk – about categorical programs, testing, standards, proficiency, funding, governance, college preparation, career technical education, merit pay, class size, accountability, English learners – but little attention to what's worked.

David Long, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's secretary of education, told an interviewer for California Schools Magazine recently that the year of education "means that we'll start that creative, assertive, thoughtful conversation. ... It's going to take some time, so I always caution people that everything isn't going to be accomplished in 12 months."

That's a relief. The governor's man says it will take more than 12 months to do the job. Since the nation has been fixing schools since the founding of the Boston Latin School in 1635, it shows a rare glimmer of realism. It's especially encouraging in a governor's office that hasn't shown much capacity for, or interest in, serious educational matters.

Because he didn't understand the issues and failed to vigorously defend his own appointments to the state board of education in the past few years, Schwarzenegger lost three of the strongest educational policymakers California has had in the past generation.

And although he vetoed some of the worst of recent bills undermining California's model academic standards, in most cases it was a near thing.

The governor still seems to believe that even in a state like California, whose low achievement levels match its low investment in schools, large improvements can be bought for little or no money.

He talks grandly about how he benefited from vocational education in Austria after World War II (take a shop course, become a champion body-builder?) but so far has shown little interest in the
complex philosophical and technical questions about how new career-tech programs should be run, funded and staffed, or who should take them.

But judging from reports of those who have recently discussed ideas for next year's school reform agenda with members of the governor's staff, the greatest impediment may be the governor's own excessive ambitions for yet another humongous ("fantastic!") headline-grabbing program that, as with his ailing health care initiative, is supposed to solve everything.

Hardly anyone doubts that the biggest task in improving schools is to attract and retain good teachers at the neediest schools, and to provide the support staff, resources and conditions that will allow them to work effectively.

That means either shifting resources from other schools, a political near-impossibility, or additional funding. Reducing achievement gaps may also require longer school days and elimination of the broken up school calendars that hundreds of thousands of students are subject to.

Schwarzenegger's Committee on Excellence in Education, headed by former Occidental College president Ted Mitchell, is likely to recommend a weighted school funding formula that would designate additional funds for each student with special needs in a district – English learners, special education students – but allow the district to allocate the funding according to its priorities. The plan would require districts to report publicly precisely how the money is spent in each school.

But there's a hitch. The California Teachers Association resists any differentials in pay or working conditions other than those based on college credits (which seem to mean little) and years of experience. And most people in the school establishment oppose honest reporting of the actual average pay of teachers in individual schools.

Without those numbers, districts can continue pretending that all their schools have teachers with similar experience and abilities, thus concealing major resource gaps among schools in the same district. They'd also be able to continue using federal money to replace, rather than supplement, funding for needy kids.

Equally important: Unless reformers recognize what everybody intuitively knows – that better education depends on a lot of things outside school, such as health care, preschool opportunities, parental engagement, housing, peer culture, neighborhood conditions, jobs, after-school programs – there's little chance for in-school reforms to show dramatic results.

American schools have long been asked for too much, often in crisis terms – winning the Cold War, keeping the nation economically competitive, combatting the evils of drugs and alcohol, teaching safe sex or no sex – and blamed for too many problems.

Critics of immigration are correct that the large numbers of children from low-skill families who come to school speaking little or no English impose additional burdens on the system.
But it's nonetheless striking – something neglected even by the learned experts who produced California's huge "Getting Down to Facts" report last spring – how much California has raised its own student test scores, and how many more are taking algebra and advanced science courses.

If the next round of reform undermines those gains, it's almost certainly doomed. In any case, beware of the rhetoric, and don't expect too much.
Undocumented kids seek aid of Congress

They hope for DREAM Act after California's legislation is vetoed.

By Susan Ferriss - Bee Staff Writer
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Disappointed that Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger vetoed the California DREAM Act this weekend, undocumented California college students and supporters say they will appeal to Congress for help with their predicament.

The students are pinning hopes on Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., and his plan to reintroduce in November a bipartisan federal proposal that would allow undocumented kids to study or join the military to earn permanent legal status.

On Saturday, Schwarzenegger's office announced he was vetoing the California Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act, which was approved by the state Legislature earlier this year. The bill would have allowed some undocumented graduates of state high schools to seek non-competitive college grants and fee waivers.

An estimated 25,000 such high school students — many of them brought to the United States as small children — graduate annually from California high schools. Nationally, such graduates could number about 65,000.

If these students perform well enough to earn admission to college, California allows them to pay in-state tuition so long as they've lived here at least three years. But they are barred from loans or other financial aid.

Most of these students face impossible barriers to legal residency because they have no family tie or other avenue allowing them to apply for residency.

Top California university administrators and many business organizations supported the state bill, contending that the state badly needs more college graduates and that undocumented kids who grew up here have nowhere else to go and should be fully assimilated.

"We don't want free money," said University of California, Davis, student Marco Diaz, who arrived in California from Mexico when he was 8 years old and grew up in the Sacramento area. "We just need access to loans," Diaz said. Undocumented students, he said, are increasingly feeling walled in by their precarious status as conditions grow tougher for illegal immigrants.
A senior, Diaz is on the brink of withdrawing this quarter because he's short $2,000 in fees even though he works two jobs.

The governor, who has said undocumented kids shouldn't be punished for the actions of their parents, cited extra costs to the state as his reason for vetoing the bill.

Sen. Gil Cedillo, D-Los Angeles, the bill's author, argued that the bill's cost would have been "minuscule" and that it would not have placed undocumented students in competition with citizens.

"The money is set aside already," Cedillo said, explaining that every year, a surplus remains after citizen students who are entitled to grants receive them.

Based on his calculations, he also said, his bill would have added $1.9 million to a total of $273 million in community college fee waiver subsidies.

Tom Mays, spokesman for the California Student Aid Commission, confirmed that historically a surplus has existed after grants are distributed – $14 million last year, and $38 million the year before. That money, by law, is returned to the general fund.

But Aaron McLear, the governor's spokesman, said: "The larger point is there are limited resources within the state budget."

Last year, Schwarzenegger vetoed a similar bill Cedillo authored that would have allowed undocumented students to seek competitive grants. Cedillo said he cut those grants out of this year's bill to try to satisfy the governor's concern.

An undocumented UC Davis student who arrived from the Philippines when he was 5 said he was disappointed but not surprised by the veto, given the hostile climate toward illegal immigrants. "The federal DREAM Act is really the long-term solution," said the student, who is close to graduating with a genetics degree and too fearful of deportation to use his name publicly.

The federal DREAM Act would allow kids who arrived in the U.S. before age 16 and lived here for at least five years to earn legal residency in six years – if they graduate from high school and attend college or serve in the U.S. military for at least two years.

The last attempt to pass the federal DREAM Act failed in September, when senators couldn't garner enough votes to attach it to a military spending bill.

A population control group called Numbers USA organized a campaign against the proposal.

"I have no trouble looking at them in the eye, and saying, 'Too bad. Life is hard,' " executive director Roy Beck said of the undocumented students. Part of his opposition, Beck said, stems from his belief that the bill would lead to an amnesty for parents because the kids could later sponsor them for legal status.
However, under current law, the children couldn't sponsor their parents until after they were citizens, which would take more than a decade.

Oiyen Poon, president of the University of California Student Association, said Monday that her group will join the U.S. Student Association to urge the Congress to pass the federal DREAM Act while continuing to press for state reforms to help undocumented students.

"We did this work because we know that many undocumented students immigrated to California as very young children, and for reasons out of their own control they are currently undocumented residents of California," Poon said.
Peter Schrag: Educate them, then deport them: This is nuts
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A bipartisan group in Congress has been struggling for years to pass the federal Dream Act, which would allow an estimated 360,000 young illegal immigrants who are recent graduates of U.S. high schools – many are now in college – to get on the track toward legal residency. An estimated 45,000 live in California.

The act is scheduled for a cloture vote in the Senate today. If it gets the required 60 votes – hardly a sure thing – it would head off the filibuster threat that conservatives have used to block it before.

The act covers students brought here by their parents as young children. Many don't speak their native language and know little about the country where they were born. Collectively they represent an investment of some $18 billion-plus in their American education.

Despite that education and their almost total assimilation into American culture – Americans in all but the right to call themselves that – they live in the shadows, can't get the jobs their skills qualify them for, can't get driver's licenses and worry constantly about deportation to places they don't know and to which they desperately don't want to go. They study in the hope someday things will change.

The Senate sponsors of the Dream Act – short for the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act, a concoction cooked up for the initials – include Dick Durbin, an Illinois Democrat; Chuck Hagel, a Nebraska Republican; and Richard Lugar, an Indiana Republican. (It's also supported by California's two Democratic senators.)

But a minority of congressional hard-liners, echoing the blog and talk-show frotters who call it amnesty for the alleged crimes of the parents who brought them here, have beaten back every attempt to pass the act. It's Old Testament redux: punish the sons for the sins of the fathers. What crime did the kids commit? The paranoid fringe also issues dark warnings that once the kids meet the stringent conditions of the Dream Act, they'll sponsor parents, sisters, cousins and aunts, thereby opening the gates to more immigrant hordes.
That's nonsense. The visa backlog for siblings is decades long. And illegal parents would have to return to the home country for 10 years or more before they would have any chance of returning legally.

As for the kids: To get a conditional residence permit under the act, they have to have arrived here before the age of 16, lived here for at least five years, have graduated from a U.S. high school, have good moral character and commit to attend college or serve in the military for at least two years. Those who meet those commitments may then become legal permanent residents. Those who don't fall back into their illegal status.

The bill is also limited to the present generation of students. No one who's been here less than five years at the time the act is passed is eligible.

There are all sorts of ways in which current U.S. immigration law is self-defeating. But there can't be any better illustration than a system that tries to force ambitious and committed U.S.-trained people out of the country at a time when both employers and the military desperately need them.

The employers warn that they'll be forced to outsource more skilled jobs, warnings reinforced by data indicating that there aren't enough Americans in our educational pipelines to replace the boomers who are now starting to retire.

Just last month, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and a bipartisan group of other governors sent a letter urging congressional leaders to make it easier for U.S. industry to bring skilled foreign workers to this country and get them to stay here.

That, they said, requires more green cards and more H1-B visas to "keep employers in our states and ensure there is a skilled workforce in this country to fill their immediate needs." Because of today's shortage of visas and delays in processing applications, "more and more of these talented individuals leave their U.S. jobs and return home."

If that need is so great, why aren't Schwarzenegger et al. also demanding passage of the Dream Act? Repeated queries to the governor's office produced a blank. Worse, despite the thousands of students who've been petitioning Congress, no one in the governor's office seems to know what the Dream Act is.

The premises of the governors' plea for more visas may be overblown. In the past decade, some unemployed American engineers and other high-tech workers charged that there was no real shortage in available U.S. workers. The shortage, they said, was artificially cooked up by employers laying off better-paid Americans and then demanding more visas to import cheaper foreign workers.

But if there's any substance to the warnings about skilled labor shortages the Dream Act could play a central role in addressing it. At a time when there's no end of rhetoric about our low high school graduation rates, why are we trying to drive those we have educated out of the country?
Fractured California may not be governable

George Skelton
Capitol Journal

October 22, 2007

SACRAMENTO — Political guru Stu Spencer warned of times like these -- warned of California being "ungovernable."

The state Capitol is imploding. Negotiations over healthcare "reform" and upgrading water facilities have pretty much blown up. These were the top priorities for Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and Democratic legislative leaders this year.

"Stakeholder" coalitions are splintering. Labor again is attacking the governor, this time over healthcare. Democratic mayors in the San Joaquin Valley are assailing Democratic legislative leaders over water.

Whatever Schwarzenegger meant in January when he heralded a new era of "post-partisanship"-- and the term did seem nonsensical -- this much we know: The governor was fantasizing.

This is a system geared for partisan gridlock, especially when there isn't strong leadership.

Spencer had it pegged 18 years ago. The story is political folklore:

Then-Sen. Pete Wilson was agonizing over whether to run for governor. Old pal Spencer -- a political advisor to presidents and governors, most notably Ronald Reagan -- invited Wilson to his isolated Oregon ranch for some frank talk among the pines and manzanita, in front of a crackling fire.

"You've got the best job in the world right now -- senator from California," Spencer told Wilson, as the sage recalls it. "I don't know why'n hell you'd run for governor. California is ungovernable."

Spencer had in mind the state's wide diversity of viewpoints, geography and problems, plus scarce resources, constant population growth and lack of political discipline.

Wilson ran anyway and won, beating Democrat Dianne Feinstein, who later bagged his Senate seat.

Last week, I called Spencer -- now 80 and semiretired -- at his Palm Springs home and asked whether he still believes the state is ungovernable.

It might be even worse, he answered.
"The public is more polarized," he said, "because we're more diverse. We've got a bigger mass of bodies and we're more diverse economically. People are divided about what they want. Like with water."

This leads to political "rigidness," he added. "There's not much unanimity or desire to compromise to reach a goal. Any time you get something done in politics, everybody has to give a little."

The public polarization is exacerbated these days, Spencer continued, by combative talk radio, cable TV shouting and instant Internet communication.

"Nothing is thoughtful. . . . People get despondent because they believe something should be done and they can't get it done."

Add to that the public's current dark view of the direction the state and nation are heading.

Says political consultant Darry Sragow, an AARP strategist for healthcare reform: "The mood of the electorate is increasingly sour. It may be that the window has closed to get healthcare done. Voters may not be interested in paying for any new initiative."

Other factors also tend to make California ungovernable:

* The two-thirds vote requirement for practically any legislation involving money. Gov. Pat Brown's historic water plan didn't require a two-thirds vote and never got one. Today, it would need to.

* Legislative term limits that result in inexperienced, shortsighted legislators rising to power.

* Egregious gerrymandering of legislative districts -- by legislators themselves -- that virtually eliminates two-party competition and results in the election of rigid ideologues. Lawmakers keep promising to surrender their redistricting power, but somehow never get around to it.

* A ballot initiative system that has run amok. What started as a citizens' reform nearly a century ago has become a tool of special interests attempting to bypass elected representatives. One bad result has been ballot-box budgeting that has removed the governor and legislators from decision-making.

* Political money has become truly obnoxious. Politicians spend much of their time -- the public's time -- hitting up special interests for campaign funds. Then it's only human to feel beholden.

Assembly Speaker Fabian Nuñez (D-Los Angeles) even has been using political money -- special-interest money -- to pay for luxurious foreign travel and expensive gifts. And he thinks that's defensible.

"He shouldn't even be over there because that's not helping to solve state problems," Spencer
says. Legislators "don't have to go to Europe to figure out what they ought to be doing in California."

Then there's Senate leader Don Perata (D-Oakland), long under a cloud of FBI investigation into suspected misuse of political money.

And we've got a governor who is stubborn, overreaches and has to be loved. That's an ineffectual mix.

Sure, these leaders managed to pass a huge package of public works bonds last year and sell it to the voters. But they did it on the credit card, by borrowing for 30 years.

That's easier than facing up to a growing budget deficit. Schwarzenegger keeps living in denial, governing on the come, betting on a revenue jackpot. At some point, he'll need to cut deeply into spending and/or raise taxes.

As Wilson did.

I called the former Republican governor and asked whether he thought California was ungovernable.

"I don't buy it," he said. "I didn't when Stu Spencer urged me not to run. The office of governor has great inherent power."

He listed some: A bully pulpit. The ability to reward and punish, by signing or vetoing bills -- also by shining the public spotlight on legislators, favorably or unfavorably.

And he can help or hurt them politically. Wilson once orchestrated the ouster of an Assembly GOP leader who refused to vote for the governor's tax increase.

"I had some fun," Wilson recalled.

He governed California in more trying times than these -- a recession, deeper deficit, drought, floods, earthquake, riot.

The Capitol today lacks strong, effective leadership in every position of power. That, along with a sorry system, makes the state look ungovernable.
Opportunities in Compton

Once-terrorized neighborhoods have a fresh chance, thanks to sheriff's deputies and others.

Article Launched: 10/29/2007 08:05:50 PM PDT

Sheriff Lee Baca has proved a point in Compton. Sheer police power can make all the difference in neighborhoods terrorized by gang violence.

And he did it for the right reasons. Compton had one of the highest murder rates in the country, but no money to pay for more policing. So Baca, whose L.A. County Sheriff's Department patrols Compton under contract, sent in 28 additional deputies on his own.

Baca told the L.A. Times he viewed the gang violence as an emerging social disaster, and taking action as a social responsibility.

The result is that some of the toughest neighborhoods are beginning to look more peaceful, and even more striking are the statistics. Gang killings have been reduced by about half, to 29 so far, and it looks like 2007 will have the lowest murder rate in 20 years.

Baca's task force moves into the neighborhoods, looking for probation violators, suspicious behavior, and above all for guns. The arrests are paying off with streets coming back to life with healthy activity, instead of loitering gangbangers.

Just as important as the blunt force of police activity, though, is intervention. Sheriff's Capt. William M. Ryan, head of the Compton station, told the Times he meets with residents regularly to encourage their involvement, and the department's local youth center offers sports activities, help with homework and access to computers.

The timing is right in other ways. Compton has several new big-box retailers, and other intervention programs are taking hold. For example Compton Superior Court Judge Kelvin D. Filer, who spends much of his time handling gang-related criminal cases, is among a growing coterie of volunteer mentors in a program for younger students at Compton High School.

Students spend time with Judge Filer and others seeing what life is like outside the neighborhoods, and what opportunities await if they continue their education. The mentoring program is run by Michael Freeman, a Georgia Tech graduate who returned to Compton and does similar work at Walton Middle School and in North Long Beach.

Filer and others also support a newly vigorous Compton High Alumni Association, which encourages grads who have moved on to other places to renew old contacts and contribute to making their former community a better place to live.
There is plenty of room for others to help by donating time or money or both. Freeman can be reached at (310) 780-4263 (mfreeman@surfside.net), and the alumni group at (310) 337-7390 (info@comptonhighalumni.com).

True, it isn't possible to help all the hundreds of youth programs in our metropolitan area, but Compton seems like a special case. As Sheriff Baca said, it's our responsibility to not let any part of the county deteriorate.

Besides, as Judge Filer says, the opportunities are so great.
LAUSD sets schedule of fees for use of its facilities

Officials say costs for after-school use are in line with what other districts and city charge groups.
By Naush Boghossian
Staff Writer

Hundreds of nonprofit youth groups across the city of Los Angeles will have to pay to use LAUSD facilities and athletic fields starting in March.

Saying the Los Angeles Unified School District’s lean financial outlook requires the move, Superintendent David Brewer III will institute a three-tiered fee structure to offset annual facilities costs of $3.8 million.

The move comes just two years after district officials abandoned similar efforts after a broad public outcry that it could force youth groups to cancel thousands of worthwhile after-school events.

LAUSD officials said the final fee structure was the result of meetings with representatives of various organizations and is in line with fees charged by the city as well as other school districts.

“The involvement of the focus group stakeholders helped us come to these recommendations that the superintendent has implemented,” said Tim Bower, director of Beyond the Bell, which oversees after-school programs at LAUSD.

“This was the result of listening to the community and developing the very best plan we could.”

While some groups will be exempt, most will fall into two for-pay categories, depending on whether they can show they serve LAUSD students.

Groups will either be charged $10 an hour for use of facilities or $25.50 an hour — in addition to a $5 daily charge and a $77.10 permit valid for four months.

To determine which fee category applies to different groups, the school district is developing a questionnaire to assess whether groups are within the district’s boundaries and serve its students.

LAUSD is one of the few school districts that doesn’t charge for use of its facilities, which it says costs the district about $3.8 million a year for utilities, maintenance and other costs.

Katheryn Friedman, manager of civic center permits, said a survey of about 15 surrounding school districts showed that even the $25.50-an-hour charge is a competitive rate.
“Everyone charges but L.A. Unified,” Friedman said.

But nonprofits argue that the fees are too high for their tight budgets and that they will be forced to pass on the costs to parents of children in the groups.

Drew Bracken, vice president of Northridge City Little League — which has about 650 youths on 50 teams that each practice up to four hours a week — said the charges are excessive.

The league will have to pay at least $2,000 a week for its 12-week season.

“I don’t think it’s right. We’re a nonprofit organization doing our best to keep kids active, keep kids focused, keep kids making good decisions,” he said. “And what are our tax dollars going for?”

“At the end of the day, it’s going to come back to the parents who are going to have to pay this fee.

“My question to L.A. Unified is, ‘Where is the breakdown of what our taxes go toward?’”

Under the final plan, the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts as well as parent-teacher associations — who use indoor facilities — will be exempt from charges.

The Girl Scouts of the San Fernando Valley, which launched a fierce campaign opposing the fees and appealed to school board member Tamar Galatzan, said the group will be able to continue using LAUSD facilities for meetings.

“If we had had to pay fees, it would have bankrupted the troops that meet there,” said Melanie Merians, chief development officer for the Girl Scouts of the San Fernando Valley.

At best, the average troop has an annual budget of about $800, she said.

“I really understand that the budget needs to be balanced, but I don’t think doing it on the backs of the girls is how you’re supposed to do it,” Merians said.

“I feel really appreciative that the school district agreed that groups like the Girl Scouts would not be appropriate to charge. We just don’t have that kind of money.”

Galatzan — who appealed directly to the LAUSD after-school program department in the wake of a group’s opposition — said she thinks the final plan is fair.

She said groups that use the athletic fields and cause wear and tear will be charged a reasonable amount, and those that use classrooms or library space will pay less.

“The plan that the district came up with really was the best we could do during the budget crunch,” Galatzan said.
“I’m glad that common sense ruled the day at L.A. Unified. Providing after-school meeting space for community groups that work with our kids is too important.”

The LAUSD issues about 2,850 permits annually to youth organizations. The district’s facilities are used about 55,000 times during the course of a year.

Bower said the district cannot yet predict how much the new fees will bring in because it’s unclear how many organizations will continue to use district facilities and which categories they will fall into.

The deadline is Jan. 15 to apply for permits for the first four-month period, which begins in March.

naush.boghossian@dailynews.com
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PLAY

The following are the three fee categories LAUSD plans to institute in March:

No charge for groups that directly benefit youth in the school district and require interior space - including Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Good News Clubs and parent-teacher associations.

$77.10 permit fee assessed every four months, plus $10 per hour, for groups using recreational facilities including gyms, fields, baseball diamonds and bleachers. In addition, $5 daily charge for toilet paper, towels and soap for groups that benefit the school district and serve its students.

$77.10 permit fee assessed every four months, plus $25.50 per hour and a $5 per-day fee, for organizations from other cities or any group that doesn't serve LAUSD students. The district says these fees still fall short of the actual $28-per-hour cost the district incurs.
The only professionals who don’t need to prepare for handling difficult conversations are those who don’t work with other people. As university administrators and executives we engage in difficult conversations of all types. They are part of normal working life.

On September 24th Lee Bollinger, president of Columbia University, engaged in a volatile, difficult, public, televised conversation with Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the President of Iran. You may or may not know first-hand what happened during Ahmadinejad’s campus visit. And it’s very likely we’ll receive even more incisive analyses of the strategy and tactics of the exchange between Bollinger and Ahmadinejad.

The controversial event took place without a riot or explosion, though the ripples still reverberate among Columbia’s trustees and alumni. How was a level of decorum maintained despite expectations of a volatile, perhaps dangerous, situation?

Before the presentation, Bollinger was under verbal attack for permitting Ahmadinejad to speak. Word on the street was that Ahmadinejad was positioning to “bash Israel and the West.” Then something tactical happened. Bollinger turned on Ahmadinejad during his introductory remarks. Specifically, Bollinger took an offensive stand against Ahmadinejad — calling him a “petty and cruel dictator” and labeling his Holocaust denials as either “brazenly provocative or astonishingly uneducated.”

Interestingly, had Bollinger taken a typical academic stance, i.e., citing the importance of freedom of speech and the exchange of ideas, the likelihood of a volatile audience response would have escalated. Instead, Bollinger decided to take one of the world’s most dangerous men to task. And he caught many listeners by surprise.

As the head of one of the world’s prestigious universities, Bollinger used his position and personality to tame the intensity of the scene. By clearly stating facts, he defined Ahmadinejad’s identity before he spoke, placing the Iranian president in a defensive posture.

Bollinger’s display of his own feelings and opinions actually engendered sympathy and calmed the environment. What he did was diffuse a very difficult situation. Regardless of one’s opinion on Ahmadinejad, and whether he should have been given a platform, Bollinger neutralized the reaction of a crowd on its way to becoming a mob. A potentially explosive event was managed to a relatively calm conclusion.
Difficult Conversations

Lee Bollinger, President of Columbia University

Lesson learned
The lesson is: There is always more than meets the ear. In earlier articles published in The Greentree Gazette, I've written about handling "incidents without precedent." This was certainly one of those. It required that the facts be told and his position be established fast. Bollinger did just that.

To diffuse a difficult conversation you must be able to convey (1) the facts, (2) your feelings and (3) the identity you want to project. You must display your own feelings in a constructive way. In this case, knowing he faced a difficult conversation, Bollinger took a risk. He did not follow typical protocol, and in my view, he saved that day.

Perhaps Ahmadinejad should or should not have been given the forum, but I admire the way Bollinger handled the situation that day.

Here's advice that always helps in difficult conversations: "Think Ahead and Take Your Time." This applies to dealing with an underperforming employee or negotiating with a difficult client. It applies when you're simply saying "no" or "I'm sorry" in a personal situation, or when you are addressing issues on the world scene.

Bollinger gave the facts, articulated his position and moved on.

Avoid or confront?
This is the speaker's dilemma. Make your decision thoughtfully. Be prepared and be deliberate. Ask yourself, "Should I raise this issue or should I keep it to myself?" Tact is good...but it is not always the best answer. Confrontation was Bollinger's strategy. In the case of Ahmadinejad, Bollinger preserved his position by asserting facts and pinning blame, and it worked.

As a doctoral student at UCLA, I was involved in many "in-basket" exercises. Professor B. Lamar Johnson placed envelopes containing difficult conversation questions and topics in each student's "in-basket." We each prepared our response and placed it in an out basket. Then we all participated in an "after action analysis." Johnson said, "Imagine what is possible and how to achieve it." I think about those sessions often.

Consider difficult conversations a normal part of life. No matter your accomplishments or position, difficult conversations will always challenge you. Improving your ability to handle difficult conversations is professional development that's continuous.
CalPERS weighs changes in fund

Board studies asset shifts, fee revision for its money managers.

By Gilbert Chan - Bee Staff Writer

Published 12:00 am PDT Tuesday, October 16, 2007
Story appeared in BUSINESS section, Page D4

FRESNO – Disappointed by stock market returns generated by outside money managers, the nation's largest public pension fund is looking at imposing a pay-for-performance plan.

The proposed strategy, unveiled Monday to trustees of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, would replace traditional management fees and play a key part in a major overhaul of the fund's massive global equities investment program.

At $150 billion, global equities account for the largest portion of CalPERS' $250 billion investment portfolio. In recent years, the results have been far from stellar.

In the past five years, the portfolio's return over the benchmark has been less than 0.25 percent. Now, the fund wants to launch an ambitious strategy to beat its annual investment return target by at least 0.5 percent – something that also would carry a higher level of risk.

Yet CalPERS faces increasing pressure to squeeze out greater returns, build assets and meet growing pension obligations. Already, CalPERS is looking to double its investments in hedge funds and corporate governance ventures, or turnaround companies.

"A model you had for 15 years is broken," CalPERS investment consultant Allan Emkin told trustees during the fund's annual out-of-town meeting this year in downtown Fresno. The $150 billion global equities program – the driving force in the meteoric growth of the fund since the 1980s – "is not firing on all cylinders. There is a better way to do it," he said.

Indeed, CalPERS officials said the overall performance of the 40 outside firms managing about $38 billion in U.S. and international stock investments are "not performing up to expectations," making it difficult to justify paying hefty fees.

"A lot of these managers are still a drag on the portfolio," said Christy Wood, senior investment officer. "It is not the intent to pay managers less. We want to pay them more for alpha, not beta."
Simply put, CalPERS doesn't want to reward managers for replicating the same results as an index fund. The fund's own investment staff could do that and save on fees. Officials propose turning over nearly $2 billion to the staff to invest in index funds or futures.

These changes, however, won't guarantee CalPERS better results.

"With each new idea and program, each one incrementally increases the risk in the portfolio. You increase the opportunity to underperform," said Michael Schlachter, a managing director at Wilshire Associates.

CalPERS also is considering shifting more investments to international stocks, which make up about a third of the global equity portfolio today.

Officials are proposing a 50-50 split. Transaction fees could be more than $300 million to make this shift.

"The world is becoming a much more global place," Wood said.

CalPERS officials point to the better returns generated by international equities in recent years. In 2006-07, for example, international stocks gained 32.9 percent, compared with 20.9 percent for U.S. equities.
JUDGE DENIES REQUEST BY DISTRICT TO LIFT SANCTIONS

By Scott Smith and Roger Phillips
November 01, 2007
Record Staff Writers
also by Roger Phillips

STOCKTON - Calling Stockton Unified School District's disregard of the Franklin High School community "appalling and reckless," a judge Wednesday denied its request to lift sanctions for Franklin's recruiting football players from American Samoa.

"The architects of this disaster are (the) coaches and administrators at Franklin High School and Stockton Unified School District," San Joaquin County Superior Court Judge Lesley Holland said in his decision.

The judge's blistering comments triggered Franklin head coach Tom Verner to say he would tender his resignation today, and it delivered yet another blow in recent weeks to the district entrenched in a fight over recruiting violations.

SUSD board President Anthony Silva, meanwhile, has called a special meeting for 6 p.m. today at the district office, 701 N. Madison St. There are three items on the agenda for closed session: performance evaluations of Superintendent Jack McLaughlin, district administrator of athletics Joe Martin and an unnamed coach; discussion of whether to discipline an administrator and a coach; and discussion of the legal case against CIF.

Holland's decision sided with Pete Saco, commissioner of the California Interscholastic Federation Sac-Joaquin Section, who punished Franklin on Oct. 16, making three of its current players ineligible and banning the football team from playoffs for five years.

"It's time to be humble," Martin said. "We lost."

The school's troubles had deepened Tuesday when the section's board of managers ordered a "death penalty," shutting down the football program because Franklin put the three disputed players on the field in Friday's victory over Tracy High School.
"It is a shame that three seniors [and, now, perhaps many more players] may be forced to forego the balance of the final year of high school football," Holland wrote, concluding his 10-page decision by adding that fault does not lie with the CIF or Saco.

"SUSD (is) a public school district, no less," Holland said.

Before making his decision, Holland heard oral arguments from attorneys in the case. Verner observed the hearing seated next to the Martin and near McLaughlin.

The three disputed Franklin players - Vincent Maene, Bruce Seumanutafa and Storm MacOmer - did not attend the hearing, but several of their teammates wearing their green jerseys quietly listened.

The district wanted Holland to block Saco's ruling on the grounds the CIF violated its bylaws to impose the punishment, denied the school district due process and infringed on the fundamental rights of the players.

"There is no fundamental right to participate in extra-curricular activities," Holland wrote, adding that California courts have repeatedly ruled that the California and U.S. constitutions do not protect a student's right to play high school sports.

Holland also ruled that:

» Before taking its case to court, SUSD first has to exhaust administrative remedies, and the district has not filed an appeal to the CIF.

» SUSD has not shown that the CIF or Saco violated section bylaws.

» SUSD failed to prove that it has a reasonable chance to prove its case in court.

Martin said a top priority is to ensure winter and spring sports teams at Franklin will be able to participate in playoffs. The section banned them from playoffs Tuesday but said if SUSD presents a plan by Dec. 15 to show that the district and Franklin would follow all bylaws, it would reconsider. The plan will be reviewed by the section's managers in January, Martin said.

Superintendent McLaughlin said the district will begin the CIF's appeals process.

"We're hoping we'll be able to get through these issues on appeal and reinstate Franklin football as soon as possible," McLaughlin said. "Stockton Unified intends to appeal immediately."
Saco had little comment about the court victory, saying that the CIF ensures a due process that was validated in court.

"The judge's decision speaks for itself," he said. "I really have nothing else to say."

Silva said he respected the judge's ruling.

"At the end of the day, all we were looking for was time to determine if the evidence presented by the CIF was correct," he said. "If there was any wrongdoing, we want to make sure the adults who are responsible will be punished."

Franklin has garnered attention outside of the area. Assemblywoman Audra Strickland, R-Thousand Oaks, said she has requested a legislative hearing to see if the CIF needs oversight before imposing sanctions that hurt innocent student athletes.

Strickland said she worried about students who transfer to another school because their parents divorce, yet strict CIF rules don't allow them to play sports. Those students might miss out on important scholarship money, she said.

"My concerns are broader than strictly the Franklin High School case," said Strickland, who anticipates a Capitol hearing in early 2008. "I think there is the need to look at the entire CIF sanction and appeals process, and ask to whom are they accountable."
O.C. school board broke meetings law, report says

By Seema Mehta
Times Staff Writer

Capistrano Unified School District trustees routinely violated the state’s open-meetings law, discussing in secret topics such as construction contracts, how to silence a district critic and ways to prepare parents for bad news about schools, all of which should have been debated in public, according to a report released by the Orange County district attorney’s office Tuesday.

Trustees tried to keep the community from participating in district decision-making and to manipulate public opinion, the report said.

"That such discussions are undertaken in secret by a body charged with the community's most important obligation, to adequately educate its young, is nothing short of disturbing," said the report by Assistant Dist. Atty. William J. Feeley.

The 56-page report is the latest blow to the beleaguered southern Orange County district, which this year saw its former superintendent and another top administrator indicted on felony charges of using public funds to influence an election and create an enemies list. Although the alleged violations of the state's open-meeting law do not meet the bar for criminal prosecution, if the district disputes the findings, prosecutors could file a lawsuit to prove the violations occurred, the report said.

Capistrano Unified spokeswoman Beverly De Nicola said the district received the report Tuesday morning. "This is a serious matter, and the board will need time to review the findings of this report," she said in a written statement.

Though most of the district's 56 schools are well-regarded, its trustees and administrators have been mired in conflicts in recent years. Critics have loudly protested the location of a new high school, opposed attendance boundary changes and fought construction of a $35-million administration complex while hundreds of classes were being held in aging portables.

The critics tried to recall the seven trustees in 2005 but didn't collect enough signatures. But they succeeded in electing three candidates to the school board in November.

In May, former Supt. James Fleming was charged with misappropriating public funds, conspiracy and using district money to influence an election, and former Assistant Supt. Susan McGill was charged with conspiracy and perjury. They pleaded not guilty in July.

District critics are gathering signatures to force a recall election against two of the remaining old-guard trustees, Marlene Draper and Sheila Benecke.

Draper and Benecke, as well as trustees Duane Stiff and Mike Darnold, and former trustees Sheila Henness, Crystal Kochendorfer and John Cassabianca, were on the board at the time of the alleged open-meeting violations. The state's Brown Act allows elected officials to meet in closed sessions in strictly limited circumstances, such as employee evaluations, labor negotiations and legal matters, and also spells out what must be disclosed publicly about these meetings.

Tony Beall, one of the leaders of the recall movement, called on Draper, Benecke, Stiff and Darnold to step down.
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Exploring a force for good

A girl trying to avoid her neighborhood's troubles is halfway through classes at the South Bay Police Explorer Academy.

By Sandy Mazza
Staff Writer

As Heidy Morales brushed her hair in a neat bun and dressed in workout clothes, her mind wandered to thoughts of murder and dead bodies.

Rehearsing a long list of police codes in her pink, blue and yellow bedroom early one recent Saturday, the 15-year-old was getting ready for her fifth week of class at the South Bay Police Explorer Academy.

It would be a 45-minute commute from her Los Angeles home to El Camino College near Torrance. Then came seven hours of drills, classes, and workouts.

The academy, which is like a miniature police academy, meets on Saturdays for 10 weeks. Students learn about the state Penal Code, writing police reports, self-defense and following commands. They even practice shooting guns.

Heidy, a Hawthorne Math and Science Academy charter student who loves fashion and likes to keep her room tidy - but not too tidy - hopes to one day work at the Hawthorne Police Department.

"I want to be Detective Morales," she said.

She will be eligible to be an officer in five years, but the volunteer Explorer program already is preparing her for the job. When she turns 18, she can also apply to be a paid police cadet or work as a parking enforcement officer.

Explorers are given training by veteran officers. They also assist police with traffic control at city events and other light duties.

Law enforcement agencies support the program because it creates a reliable stream of well-trained officers.

Gardena Police Chief Ed Medrano began his career as an Explorer in the Manhattan Beach Police Department when he was 13. He also served in the military.
"The police academy was a piece of cake after being an Explorer and in the Marine Corps," Medrano, 38, said. "By then I had a lot of experience."

Thirty-eight kids already have dropped out of the academy this semester. Heidy and the 26 others who remain are sponsored by their hometown police departments in Gardena, Hawthorne, Torrance, Inglewood and Santa Monica.

Heidy said she is motivated by her positive attitude and drive to succeed.

"I would do anything it takes, as hard as it is," she said. "It's not easy."

She lives in a crime-ridden neighborhood in South Los Angeles and commutes to school and to the academy. Gang members and drug users are common sights on her block, and she is passionate about not going down the wrong road.

At the academy, Torrance police officer Chuong Vo trained students how to use the least amount of force to gain control of a suspect.

Taking turns playing officer and criminal, the students practiced searching crooks, patted each other down, pressed their chins down to protect them from being choked by bad guys, and punched and kicked gym mats.

Heidy giggled while partner and friend Lance Quintero, 15, pretended to handcuff her.

The girls said they help each other press on through difficult times - when the pressures of schoolwork, academy homework and their personal lives overwhelm them.

"We motivate each other," Heidy said. "We call each other when we have breakdowns."

Compared with the academy, school is a breeze, the girls said - even though other students call them "pigs" and other derogatory names.

The academy has given her self-assurance.

"I feel more disciplined in my moral ethics. Stronger," she said.

Current academy members are only a few weeks away from becoming eligible to be Explorers, but it seems a distant goal to them now.

During a recent visit to the Hawthorne Police Department's Explorer class, Heidy and the other students were in awe as they watched a group of experienced volunteers breeze through drills they had been struggling with.

The Explorers simulated a high-risk traffic stop, guided by veteran officers. They used parked
police cars and plastic yellow guns as their tools to make mock arrests in the department's basement parking lot.

"Throw your keys out the window," Explorer Diane Carmona, 18, shouted at other Explorers who were pretending to be suspects inside a car. "Keep your hands up. Walk back toward the sound of my voice with your hands in the air. Get down on your knees. Cross your feet. Put your hands behind your head."

Between practice drills, Explorer adviser and police Detective Shawn Galindo, who began his career at the academy, did not let them forget the dangerous nature of the job.

"The people you are dealing with more than likely just committed a felony," Galindo told them. "You don't know what their mind-set is. At any time, someone can jump up in the back seat and fire at your police car. □

"Your main objective is to go home at the end of the night."

Academy students watched, wearing white T-shirts with their last names written in block letters, as the uniform-clad Explorers practiced.

"We're just excited because this will be us in a couple months," Heidy said.

Carmona reminisced on her experiences with drill instructors when she attended the Explorer Academy a few years ago.

"At first you hate them," she said. "Then at the end you think they're actually pretty cool, even though they yell at you: 'Do you think you're a princess? You think you're special?'"

Heidy said she has learned to appreciate the kind of pressures drill instructors place on academy members.

"Law enforcement and discipline really inspires me," she said. "I see the world in a different way."

Near the end of a recent class, and with a hearty "hoo-rah" cheer, students filed outside to complete an obstacle course that would serve as their midterm exam.

They sprinted, jumped a 6-foot wall, ran up stairs, did a soldier crawl across the soccer field, and did push-ups. Heidy struggled to get over the wall. When pulling herself up with her arms didn't suffice, she used a nearby pole to leverage her weight over. Drenched in sweat, biting her lower lip, she twisted forward and up until she got the better of it and jumped over.

At the end, she proudly announced that she and other kids did the obstacle course in just over four minutes - faster than before.
"We beat our time," she said.

After the class, Heidy's mom drove her home. Then she was off to work as a night-shift hostess at the Westchester restaurant where her father works as a kitchen manager.

Her mother is a janitor who once dreamed of becoming an officer, Heidy said.

"She didn't have enough support, but she's there when I need her," she said. "I don't take this for granted."

sandy.mazza@dailybreeze.com

WANT TO JOIN?

WHAT: The South Bay Police Explorer Academy

WHO: Open to local students ages 14 to 20

WHEN: Next class begins in February

COST: Free for students who are sponsored by a police department

INFORMATION: Academy adviser Shawn Galindo, 310-349-2853
Saturday, October 20, 2007 (SF Chronicle)
S.F. teachers, police to get city's help with home down payments
Cecilia M. Vega, Chronicle Staff Writer

Hoping to keep teachers and police officers from fleeing San Francisco because of its high cost of living, city officials unveiled a program Friday that offers down-payment assistance for the two professions.

Credentialed teachers employed by the San Francisco Unified School District who are purchasing their first home in the city could receive a $20,000 interest-free loan to help cover the cost of a down payment.

Teachers whose households earn less than 200 percent of the area median income, roughly $120,000, would be eligible. If teachers remain employed in the district for 10 years, the loan will be completely forgiven.

"Teachers tend to be young when they start with our district," said Myrna Melgar, director of the homeownership program in Mayor Gavin Newsom's Office of Housing. "They're at that age where they want to set roots and start a family and it's tough to do here."

Newsom first announced the down-payment assistance program for teachers in his 2005 State of the City speech, but it received funding for the first time in the city's 2007-08 fiscal year budget.

One million dollars was set aside in the city's general fund for the program, enough to cover loans for 50 teachers.

Police also will receive $20,000 loans for down payments as part of a collective bargaining agreement reached this summer between the city and the union that represents officers, the Police Officers Association.

Officers who are in good standing - meaning they have no disciplinary actions pending - and who are purchasing their first home in San Francisco are eligible. There is enough funding in the bargaining agreement to cover 25 interest-free loans, which will be issued on a first-come, first-serve basis and will be forgiven in five years as long as the officer remains in service.
O.C. reaches tentative deal with sheriff's union

Agreement increases pay for deputies and replaces the retiree medical grant with individual health savings accounts.
By David Reyes, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer
October 20, 2007

After a series of work slowdowns affecting Orange County courts, sheriff's deputies Friday reached a tentative labor agreement with the county that would raise their salaries and possibly save the county $140 million by restructuring retirees' medical plans.

Under the new three-year deal, deputies would receive a pay hike of 4.75% retroactive to October 2006, an immediate raise of 4.6% and another 3% increase in October 2008.

The agreement also calls for an outside audit of the medical trust fund administered by the 1,600-member Assn. of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs.

For years, the powerful deputies union had fought efforts to allow its fund to be examined.

Officials for the county, which contributes about $629 per month for each deputy, estimate that the fund holds about $13.4 million in excess reserves.

According to the terms of the agreement, the sheriff's association will be the first bargaining unit in the county to replace the retiree medical grant with individual health savings accounts, a move county officials contend helps reduce long-term healthcare costs and eliminate an unfunded liability.

County CEO Thomas G. Mauk called the agreement a "landmark accomplishment."

Representatives of the county sheriff's deputies association could not be reached for comment.

During negotiations, the deputies staged job slowdowns at the courts that delayed some trials but ended after Dist. Atty. Tony Rackauckas and Sheriff Mike Carona intervened.

The agreement appears to end a public feud between the sheriff's association and county Supervisor John Moorlach, whom they blamed for having to work nine months without a contract. Among other things, the union attempted to bar him from attending deputies' funerals and Moorlach labeled union activists "thugs."
On Friday, however, Moorlach's assistant, Mario Mainero, described the supervisor as "delighted" with the new agreement and the "hardworking men and women of law enforcement."

County supervisors are expected to approve the contract at Tuesday's board meeting.
A Labor Union Plants a Flag for Academic Freedom in an Era of Fewer Tenured Positions

By JOHN GRAVOIS

One of academe's largest labor unions, the American Federation of Teachers, released today its first comprehensive statement on academic freedom—a fresh indication that the worries of today's academics run deeper than salaries and benefits.

The statement, called "Academic Freedom in the 21st-Century College and University," is an attempt to frame the issues of academic freedom for an era when the system of tenure" once the bedrock principle of scholarly free exchange’ is breaking down. According to the union, 70 percent of university instructors work off the tenure track.

Hence, the statement's rhetoric aims to shore up the standing of all university instructors, tenured or not, by emphasizing their status as professionals.

"The basic and really central point is that educators should be making educational decisions," said Arthur Hochner, the main author of the statement and an associate professor of human-resource management at Temple University. "We want our faculty to be treated as professionals and not just as hired hands."

The statement's standards for academic freedom are based heavily on the American Association of University Professors' 1940 statement on academic freedom and tenure, but its strategies nod to the union's organizing and political strengths.

"We approach [academic freedom] as a union," said Lawrence Gold, director of the union's higher-education division. "As such, we think in terms of organizing as a way to harness the collective power of the faculty."

Specifically, the statement describes academic freedom as a key principle driving one of the union's major campaigns, a national legislative effort to increase the ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure-track positions in America, while also raising the pay of nontenured instructors.

The last few months have been a season of flag-planting for defenders of academic freedom. In September came a statement from the American Association of University Professors, "Freedom in the Classroom." And last week an online petition from a new group, the Ad Hoc Committee to Defend the University, was posted online, asking professors to pledge their resistance to outside interference in tenure decisions.
Knowledge for rent

Competing bills aim to reduce their cost while students and educators seek out alternatives.

By MARLA JO FISHER
The Orange County Register

College students have been hammered in recent years by soaring costs for everything from tuition to rent to gasoline to the coffee-house java that fuels all-night study sessions.

One of the most frequent complaints has always been about textbook prices, now averaging $900 per year, according to a 2004 study by the California Public Interest Research Group. That's more than many community college students spend on a year's tuition.

This weekend, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger has two competing bills on his desk, both seeking to make textbooks more affordable, that he must sign or veto by today, or they'll expire.

"Books are generally really expensive and getting higher," Mohamed Eldessouky, the student body president of UC Irvine, said Wednesday, adding he hopes the governor will sign one of the bills, SB832. "My buddy just bought an economics book yesterday for $163."

SB832 would, among other things, require publishers to tell faculty in advance about the entire range of books available in their subject matter and how much they cost.

That bill is opposed by the Association of American Publishers, saying it creates onerous and unnecessary new disclosure rules for textbook publishers, while not fixing other links in the textbook supply chain.

"We have 240 introductory algebra books available every day in the bookstores," said Bruce Hildebrand, executive director for higher education at the Association of American Publishers. "Which ones are you talking about? Some cost $20 and some cost $120."

Hildebrand said the country's 4,500 textbook publishers should not be told how to publicize their books, and that the burden of textbook price reform should not fall entirely on publishers.

Meanwhile, college officials around the country are moving forward with other ways to save students money, including rental programs, e-books, custom printed books and free course materials that are increasingly available online.

Some of the changes are driven by the need for college bookstores to stay competitive. A generation ago, students had little choice but to shop at their school's bookstore to fill their book lists, hoping only that cheaper used copies would be available.
Today, students look for books on Web sites that sell used and marked-down materials. Some buy books from other countries, where they're cheaper.

Publishers are coming out with digital book programs, from which students can download information at half the cost of buying a new book.

And some schools like Cal State Fullerton are experimenting with rental programs. This year, CSUF is only offering 29 books for rent — but 5,000 students have taken advantage of the program.

Books rent for about one-third of the cost of a new book. Titan Shops manager Chuck Kissel said he invites faculty to sign up, and asks them to guarantee that the books they assign through the rental program will be used for at least two years, to make the program financially viable.

"We are making a little less (profit) but we are finding more students are shopping with us," Kissel said, adding that he expects to continue to grow the rental business. It helps students financially not only because they pay less, but because they don't have to shell out hundreds of dollars in advance, with the hope that they can later get some of it back by reselling the book.

For example, the bookstore rented 516 copies of the "Nature of Mathematics" this term for $44.95 per semester, less than half the $130 it cost to buy the book new or the $97.50 cost of the used edition.

UC Irvine doesn't have a rental program, but students are trying to develop a more robust used-book buy-back program to help students save money.

UCI students who wanted this fall to buy all the textbooks for a single basic Biology 100 class would have spent $216.50 at the UCI bookstore.

Some students split the cost of books and agree to share them, but that can have its downside.

"It's a good way to save money, but it's inconvenient," Eldessouky said. "Especially at finals, when you need the book to study."

Eldessouky said his pet peeve is a standard publishing practice of creating new editions of books every few years, even if there's little or no new material, which makes used books obsolete and impossible to sell back.

Books that are used repeatedly, in the same edition, are cheaper because students can find used copies, either in the college bookstore or online. They can then save even more money by selling the books back at the end of the term.

The typical way textbooks end up in the classroom is as follows: Publishers create the products and then the faculty receives a selection list from the publishers, from which they can choose the books they want students to read. Then the chair of the college department approves the selections, and the list goes to the bookstore, which orders the materials for students to buy.
Some faculty who want to help students have complained that they can't choose the lowest-priced books because publishers don't put prices in their catalogs.

Others seek out the cheapest ways their students can access the same information.

English Professor Suzanne Crawford of Cerritos College said she has low-income students who don't want to spend $1.50 to buy a cheap edition of "Hamlet" for her class.

For them, Crawford recommends the Gutenberg Project, an online collection of tens of thousands of free books and other materials that are in the public domain and can be accessed at no cost.

She also has begun ordering custom books, where a publishing house will compile selected readings into a book specifically for a class. This can save money vs. requiring students to buy several books per semester.

"Right now, I am teaching an English 100 class with the theme of relationships," Crawford said. "I ordered 20 different articles and had a custom textbook created that only cost the students about $20. That way, they use 100 percent of the stuff, instead of reading 10 percent and then the rest is waste."

Other college officials go even farther. Several community colleges have formed a coalition to encourage the use of "open courseware," or free classes and materials that are available on the Internet, as part of an international movement. Some were created at universities like UCI, Notre Dame and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"Not only are these materials saving students money, we are also discovering the material is better than conventional textbooks," said Hal Plotkin, board president at the Foothill-De Anza Community College District in Silicon Valley, which has spearheaded the coalition.

Plotkin's district has set aside resources to help faculty locate and develop course materials that can be used online for free.

"We've found there's a real desire on the part of most faculty to use these materials, but they have difficulty finding them and are not sure which ones they can legally use," Plotkin said.

He expects colleges to someday shut down their bookstores entirely and "get out of the dead tree business."

Meanwhile, the Association of American Publishers has created a Web site called www.textbookfacts.org in which they explain their key points in the wake of criticism for high textbook prices.

"College students spend more on electronics, cell phones, dorm room decorations, clothes and accessories, and their cars than they do on textbooks," one of the key facts reads.

That may be true, UCI student president Eldessouky acknowledged.
"But some of those things are necessities, and, in any event, unlike textbooks, they can still be used a year later," he said.
Student Aid Has Gained, but College Costs Have Risen Faster, Surveys Find

By LIBBY SANDER

Financial aid to college students has increased by 82 percent over the past decade but still falls short of covering the average price of a college education, as the cost of attending the nation's public universities has continued to outpace inflation, family income, and sources of grant aid, according to two new surveys from the College Board.

More than $130-billion in grants, federal loans, Work-Study funds, and education tax credits and deductions was distributed to undergraduate and graduate students in the 2006-7 academic year, one of the surveys found, while students borrowed an additional $18-billion from state and private lenders to pay for their education.

But aid from the federal government, though still a major source of financial assistance for many students, is not keeping pace with rising costs, according to a report on the survey, "Trends in Student Aid."

Federally subsidized Stafford loans, in which the government pays the interest on a loan while the student is in school, accounted for less than a third of total student aid in 2006-7, down from 54 percent 10 years ago.

Pell Grants, which provide need-based assistance to low-income students, covered 32 percent of tuition, fees, and room and board costs at the average public four-year college, down from covering 54 percent of such costs 20 years ago.

And federal loans altogether made up less than half of all undergraduate aid in an increasingly complex web of financing options, the survey found.

Private loans, by contrast, now represent nearly a quarter of all education loans, up from 6 percent a decade ago, the survey found.

The College Board released the findings of the student-aid survey, along with a companion report, "Trends in College Pricing," on Monday (The Chronicle, October 22).

A summary table and a tuition database of thousands of colleges are available on The Chronicle's Web site.
Concerns About Growth of Private Loans

Commenting on the reports' findings, Gabriel Pendas, president of the United States Student Association, said, "This really paints a picture of the crisis we're seeing in higher education."

"The students taking out private loans are the ones who don't have any other option," Mr. Pendas said. "They've maxed out their federal loans, and the Pell Grants are not doing enough. It's a prime example of what, in a lot of ways, has been the privatization of our higher-education system."

Loans from private and state sources represented about 29 percent of loans taken out by undergraduates and 12 percent of loans taken out by graduate students, the student-aid survey found. Growth in private loans, which are generally more costly than loans backed by the federal government, was 27 percent a year in the five years preceding the 2006-7 academic year but slowed to a 6-percent rise last year.

A decade ago, undergraduates rarely turned to private loans, said Robert Shireman, executive director of the Project on Student Debt, an advocacy group. Now, while a relatively small proportion of undergraduates relies on private loans to pay for college, Mr. Shireman said he was concerned that such loans are increasingly common and pose significant financial risk for students because of variable interest rates and a lack of protections in the event of unemployment or disability.

"I hate to even call it 'financial aid.' We don't call a loan to buy a car 'financial aid," said Mr. Shireman, who was a senior education-policy adviser in the Clinton administration. "They have a much heavier drag on a college graduate just entering the work force."

Students at the nation's community colleges did receive a substantial amount of their aid from the federal government. The Pell Grant program was the only federal student-aid program to award a significant share of its dollars to students at public two-year institutions, who make up 32 percent of all full-time undergraduates, the survey found.

While students at community colleges received 34 percent of all Pell Grant dollars in the 2005-6 academic year, they received 9 percent of all assistance from the federal campus-based aid programs, 7 percent of subsidized Stafford loans, 6 percent of unsubsidized Stafford loans, and 1 percent of all federal PLUS loans (for parents), the survey found.

Faster Gains in Public-College Costs

The survey on college pricing, meanwhile, found that the average cost of a college education rose faster than the inflation rate this year, particularly at public four-year institutions. In-state tuition and fees at public four-year institutions during the 2007-8 academic year increased 6.6 percent from 2006-7, the survey found, while the price for out-of-state students rose 5.5 percent.
In dollar amounts, those increases meant that the average cost of tuition and fees for in-state students was $6,185, or $381 more than last year, the survey found. For out-of-state students, it was $16,640, or $862 more than the 2006-07 figure.

At private four-year institutions, tuition and fees increased 6.3 percent from last year, with the average cost of tuition and fees reaching $23,712, or $1,404 more than last year.

Public two-year institutions posted a 4.2-percent increase from last year's amount, averaging $2,361, or $95 more than last year.

The increase in tuition and fees this year at the nation's four-year public colleges was in keeping with a trend that has persisted for three decades, according to the survey. From 1977-78 to 2007-08, the rate of growth in the price at such institutions has been faster than at private institutions, and the dollar gap between the cost of tuition at the two types of institutions "widens every year even after adjusting for inflation," the survey found.
PressTelegram.com

LBCC to put $440M bond on Feb. ballot
College board votes unanimously to raise money for projects.

By Kevin Butler, Staff writer
Article Launched: 11/07/2007 11:03:00 PM PST

LONG BEACH - The Long Beach City College Board of Trustees on Wednesday unanimously voted to put a $440 million bond measure before voters next year to fund potential projects such as new classrooms for mathematics, technology and culinary arts programs.

The five-member board was facing a Friday deadline to direct Los Angeles County officials to place the measure on the ballot for the Feb. 5 general primary election.

LBCC board President Doug Otto said that the bond money is needed to build state-of-the art classrooms and facilities for the college's development.

"If our bond campaign is successful, the future looks bright for Long Beach City College and its students," he said.

To pass, the measure requires approval from at least 55 percent of the voters taking part in the election.

Otto said that passage of the bond measure would qualify the college to receive about $60 million in matching funds from the state.

In addition to new projects, the bond money also would be used for projects that LBCC had planned to start as part of a 2002 bond measure but is now unable to begin due to rising construction costs over the last several years, college officials said.

In 2002, voters approved Measure E, providing $176 million in bond money to LBC. So far, its funding has been used to complete such projects as a new Child Development Center at the Pacific Coast Campus.

There are sufficient funds to complete Measure E projects currently underway, LBCC officials said.

But unanticipated cost increases in construction and building materials have forced the college to hold off on some projects envisioned when Measure E was passed, officials said.

A new bond measure is needed to continue plans for modernization and new construction, said trustee Jeff Kellogg.
Voters "are going to realize what a great investment this will be for the future of this college," he said.

The board's action came a day after the Long Beach City Council voted unanimously to repeal an ordinance banning "big-box" superstores instead of spending more than $500,000 to put it to a public vote on the Feb. 5 ballot.

The bond measure that will go before voters next year would represent a tax extension of Measure E.

The estimated maximum property tax rate under the proposed bond measure would be $19.97 per $100,000 of assessed valuation, beginning in the fiscal year 2032-2033.

The $19.97 rate is about the same as the maximum tax rate planned under Measure E.
From the Los Angeles Times

L.A. board may shift $1 billion to school construction

The Measure Y bond money was approved by voters in 2005 for modernizing existing campuses.
By Howard Blume
Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

October 23, 2007

Los Angeles school district officials want to close most of a staggering deficit in the school-construction program by using more than $1 billion in bond money that was meant for other purposes. The Los Angeles Board of Education is scheduled to vote on the shift today.

The proposal, expected to pass, would use for new schools money that would have repaired and modernized existing schools, improved Internet access and other technology on campuses, and built and repaired preschool centers. Instead, the funds will backfill the plan to build 145 schools in an effort to provide all students with a neighborhood campus that operates on a traditional two-semester schedule.

The $20-billion construction and modernization program is the nation's largest and frequently touted as a seminal accomplishment. But the effort has run up against spiraling increases in property values and construction costs.

"Our hope here is that this is just a borrowing, if you will, of those funds" and the original programs "will be finished sometime in the future with other funds, whether they be from future bond measures or from other sources," said Edwin Van Ginkel, senior development manager for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Van Ginkel added that the bond's wording allows for such a transfer.

But the fine print of ballot resolutions is not enough, said Jamie Court, president of the Santa Monica-based Foundation for Taxpayer & Consumer Rights.

"Politicians will try to use whatever money is on hand to fill any hole they have," Court said. "And in those cases they're often very flexible with 'the voter's intent' when the voter's intent wasn't that elastic. Politicians can't lawfully seize on the fine print to use money where that use was not made explicitly clear."

When voters passed Measure Y in 2005, they authorized nearly $4 billion in school bonds. The breakdown included $1.6 billion for new schools, $1.48 billion for existing schools, $325 million for technology and $100 million for early education.

The resolution before the school board would take $790 million from repair of existing schools, $200 million from technology and $60 million from early education. Each cut is greater than half of the bond money allocated.
Van Ginkel said the loss would not be felt for perhaps two years, because of money left from other bond measures and elsewhere.

But he acknowledged that from the start, the backlog of district needs surpassed all available funding. No local school bonds had been approved for 34 years before four won passage starting in 1997.

"We’re building to make up for 20 years where the district built very few new schools," he said, adding that enrollment grew by 226,000 students from 1980 to 2002. In the past, he said, the district got by with 10,000 portable classrooms, a year-round schedule and involuntary busing.

District staff members cite both progress and continued needs. The number of year-round schools has declined from 227 to 142. In 2002, 16,000 students were bused out involuntarily, compared with 6,600 now. It helps that since 2003, enrollment declined from 747,000 to less than 700,000.

Even after all the planned construction, tens of thousands of students will still attend classes in portables.

Justifications aside, a promise to voters is a promise, said Jon Coupal, president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. "There was a factual determination that over a billion dollars was needed to renovate schools where students are going right now. To take money away from that seems a fundamental violation of public trust."

The point is not lost on Scott Folsom, vice-chair of the district’s bond oversight committee.

Even after the new schools are built, he said, 80% to 90% of students will be attending schools that exist today.

"Just as we didn't build schools for 20 or 30 years, we also didn't keep them up," he said.

Still, the oversight committee approved the transfer last week. Its decision is not binding on the school board, which rarely goes against such recommendations.

Folsom foresees another difficult juncture approaching: "We are going to need to go to the voters at some point in the future -- not that far away -- to ask for more money."
State schools bad, L.A. worse
By Naush Boghossian, Staff Writer
Article Last Updated: 11/08/2007 11:40:50 PM PST

California students are among the nation's worst academic achievers, and those in the Los Angeles Unified School District are faring even worse than the statewide average, according to a UCLA study released Thursday.

In one of the broadest looks at California's education system, the state's high school students ranked near the bottom nationwide on key markers including achievement, graduation and college-enrollment rates.

If current trends continue, every high school in California will fail to achieve proficiency in math by the 2014 goal set by the federal No Child Left Behind law, the report's researchers found.

And while obstacles in California are greatest for African-American and Latino students, the study indicates that the state's education system has problems that go far beyond a persistent racial gap in achievement.

"This cultural argument suggests that the problem of low test scores resides within the African-American and Latino communities," said Jeannie Oakes, associate director of UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education & Access.

"It fails to account for the fact that California students generally have lower test scores than students across the nation."

State Superintendent of Schools Jack O'Connell's representatives had not read the report, but he had released a statement on the recent findings on the California High School Exit Exam, which he said underscored "how critically important it is that we mount a statewide effort to close the achievement gap."

O'Connell noted that even though the reporting of dropouts is still imprecise until they implement a statewide student tracking system, the issue remains a serious concern.

And the study further affirms that the LAUSD's graduation rate is even more troubling.

For every 100 ninth-graders in non-San Fernando Valley schools, 44 had graduated four years later and 24 had passed courses required for admission to CSU and UC schools.

In Valley schools, 48 had graduated and 25 had passed those courses. The statewide averages are 66 and 25.
In its report, the institute studied the Class of 2006 at every California high school, detailing the rates of completion, enrollment in the state's four-year colleges and universities and assignment of well-qualified teachers.

The study also incorporated results of the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress, which showed that California's fourth-graders rank 48th in reading and 46th in math. Meanwhile, eighth-graders ranked 47th in reading and 45th in math.

Researchers also included reports on the percentage of 12th-graders enrolling in four-year colleges, which found that the rate of enrollment put California ahead of only Mississippi and Arizona.

California's high school graduation rate of 66 percent also is well below the national average, and researchers found an unequal distribution of qualified teachers and classroom sizes - particularly in intensely minority schools.

Problems also included secondary schools that are generally larger than in any state except Florida. In California, more than 25 percent of students attend schools acknowledged as overcrowded, said John Rogers, co-director of the UCLA institute.

California's math, science and social studies classrooms have more students, on average, than similar classrooms in any other state, Rogers said.

Middle and high school students across the state also have poor access to counselors, Rogers said.

In the Los Angeles Unified School District, the problems are magnified.

A staggering 62 percent of schools are overcrowded, according to the state Department of Education definition - compared with 16 percent in the state. In addition, 13 percent of the LAUSD's schools are experiencing severe shortages of qualified teachers, compared with 6 percent statewide.

At half of the LAUSD's schools, more than one-fifth of the college prep math classes are taught by teachers without credentials to teach math - compared with a 32 percent statewide average.

And at Valley schools - which historically have performed better than the rest of the LAUSD - researchers found students are not performing significantly above the districtwide averages in key areas.

The Valley boasts more fully credentialed teachers, teachers with appropriate credentials in college prep courses and math teachers with appropriate credentials to teach college prep math.

But both Valley and non-Valley schools had about 9 percent of their Class of 2006 enrolled in Advanced Placement math in the 12th grade - just under the state average of 11 percent.
And the LAUSD fell far below the state average of 80 percent of the class of 2006 passing the math section on the California High School Exit Exam by grade 12.

About 74 percent in Valley schools passed; 64 percent in non-Valley schools.

Meanwhile, 77 percent of students in Valley schools passed the English portion of the test by grade 12, while just 69 percent in non-Valley schools did.

Still, both of those are lower than the state average of 82 percent.

LAUSD Superintendent David Brewer III said he's been aggressively lobbying the state for more funds - and more flexibility in how to spend the money.

"You not only need more money, but we need some of the restrictions on the money relaxed so we can use it in more innovative ways and tailor it because all schools don't have the same needs," he said.

In the meantime, the district is pursuing other avenues to reduce class and school sizes through its facilities program and personalizing school environments.

The district is also working on strengthening its standards-based curriculum - and particularly targeting its more than 250,000 English-learners - and creating more robust professional development programs.

"What we have determined is when you have super-large schools, you lose the personalized learning environment," Brewer said. "So we've implemented a small learning community strategy, particularly at secondary schools."

And officials are working on creating a culture of high expectations, stepping up recruitment of qualified math and science teachers, as well as providing the services to meet the special social needs of their student population.

Ultimately, Rogers said, to close the gaps dividing California's students will require directing more resources and investment to key areas.

"The statistics shown in this report suggest that solving educational inequity requires a two-pronged strategy," he said.

"One that improves California's education infrastructure overall and, at the same time, targets resources and support to students concentrated in the much smaller proportion of middle and high schools that suffer from an even greater lack of essential educational resources."

LAUSD school board member Julie Korenstein said California's standards are higher than most states' but there has to be adequate funding to give enough resources to schools, particularly those in high-poverty areas, to be able to meet those standards.
"If you don't have the funding to pull up English-learners, children of poverty and learning-disabled students by the bootstraps, then you can't do it. You're hitting your head against the wall," she said. "A lot of people will say you don't need the money, but if you want to hire the best teachers and reduce class size, it costs money."
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Lessons From the Top

By STEPHEN J. TRACHTENBERG

Last summer I finished a 30-year run as a university president — first at the University of Hartford for 11 years, then at George Washington University for 19 years. I'm pleased to report that I have served without ever having a deficit budget, being indicted, or even being accused of any impropriety. I like to think that's in part because I have learned some lessons along the way.

First, I've learned that academic bureaucrats at all levels need luck — in generous quantities. Consider the case of Richard H. Brodhead, president of Duke University, an admirable man and able administrator. When players on the Duke lacrosse team were faced with charges of rape, many people demanded to know how it was possible that Brodhead did not understand that lacrosse players were seen as notoriously "thuggish" and "entitled." Why had he done nothing?

When the charges turned out to be bogus — the plaintiff was not credible, and the prosecutor appeared to have engaged in serious misconduct — many people wondered how Brodhead could have let the situation get so out of hand on such flimsy evidence. Why had he done nothing?

That double bind is now known as "being Duked." It arises from the public's preposterous expectation of omniscience in college presidents, as well as in lower-ranking administrators in proportion to their status. (In other words, it only gets worse with each promotion.) Thus, the head of a university with 30,000 students, 5,000 faculty and staff members, and another few thousand adjuncts and visitors is supposed to control the behavior of all those people. But would anyone expect the mayor of Burlington, Vt., a city with a population of about 40,000, to know what mischief any of his fellow citizens might be contemplating at every moment?

The answer is no, of course not. But for some reason, people hold colleges to a different standard than other institutions. That may be because academics are supposed to be smarter. Or it may be because some people get a thrill of schadenfreude when the ivory tower turns out to be made of mud bricks and wattles. Whatever the case, college presidents and top administrators need luck.

Second, I've learned to try to know as much as possible about my institution — to be, if not omniscient, at least informed. Also, I've learned to let the world know when things are good, to publicize, for example, how many students do volunteer work in the community or the results of important research. That is called making our luck, and it is quite different from the dumb luck that keeps a cheating or sexual scandal from erupting. We might call it "sweat luck," similar to the scriptural thunderbolt, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Academic administration is sweaty work. If we can appear cool as a cucumber while we engage in it, so much the better, but we should always carry a bandanna in our pocket.

My third lesson: Administration requires patience. The bright side of working in academe is the companionship of many intelligent people whose expertise is engaging and instructive. The dark side is that such bright, expert colleagues often think the administrator who has denied them, say,
a new building is too boneheaded and biased to realize how pressing their needs are or to appreciate the importance of their department, field, or specialty.

It may be of no account to them that their enrollments are scanty and declining, or that the requests of another department are supported by more-compelling evidence. As for the first proposition, they will say numbers are not a reliable measure of contribution. As for the second, even though the biology and religion departments may be in the same college, their members may not always rejoice in each other's good fortune.

Students can also try an administrator's patience. Oscar Wilde observed that he was "not young enough to know everything." Sophomores are. And so we are told, year after year, how to run our institutions. We may be instructed that charging tuition is a sign of vice, that grading is a sign of elitism, that the president's pursuit of money is a sign of anti-intellectual depravity — and thus instructed in a letter so grammatically inept that we make a note to have a heart-to-heart with the head of admissions and the director of the freshman-writing program.

The only possible response is a patient explanation of the importance of tuition, grading, fund raising, and other topics. The complaints won't vanish — they seem to be carried in the college's water supply — but a reasoned response can blunt them and even provide opportunities to point students to issues that are worthy of complaint. Students are often looking for causes. We should find a constructive way for them to use their energy.

Several other things I've learned are reflected in a personal story. Once my father faced suspension of his driver's license, after receiving a moving violation on top of a number of previous infractions. I had just obtained my law degree and offered to represent him. His violation was for driving after dusk without his headlights, and I checked the National Weather Service tables and discovered that dusk had arrived at 8:06 that day. The time on the ticket was 8:05 p.m. I got the case dismissed. But when I told my father that we had won, he said, "You didn't win. The cop screwed up."

The lessons from that story are twofold. First, pay attention to details. Second, do not expect gratitude. If you receive it, you are blessed to be working with exceptionally good and humane colleagues.

Another lesson is about leadership, a simple word that has acquired a peacock tail of complexity trailing behind it. I want to offer just one bright feather. Leadership, we read in endless management books, requires "vision," so a leader needs to be "a visionary." We shouldn't believe that. Ezekiel was a visionary, and Chapters 1 and 37 of Ezekiel in the Old Testament are moving and some of the finest scriptural eloquence we have. But I doubt that I am alone in being confused about the wheels in Chapter 1 and the dry bones in Chapter 37. Sometimes it is better to be concrete than eloquent. It is better to have a point of view or a series of goals than a vision that is subject to many interpretations or baffled silence.

When I came to George Washington, my point of view was to transform the university from being a commuter institution — or so it was perceived, though not quite accurately — with a negligible reputation and small endowment into a residential research university with an international reputation and some money in the bank. I tried to make incremental changes through alliances, not fiat — to make trustees, faculty members, and administrators my collaborators. Instead of laying out a vision and commanding it, I described one goal and why I thought it was good, and then I asked others to help me achieve it. Then I did it over and over, goal by goal.
Some people have called me a true visionary. But I just had a point of view on one matter and then another and so on and was able to persuade colleagues to turn those ideas into specific goals that we would capture together.

Beyond learning such lessons, I have adopted a handful of helpful techniques over the years. I write a personal reply to every letter and message that I receive. While time-consuming, it enables me to engage with strangers and reconnect with those familiar to me. I think nothing strengthens my authority and standing among town and gown more than having an outbox as full in the evening as my in box was in the morning.

I also recognize that a big idea — like a curricular overhaul — is just something written down on paper. To make it work requires the appropriate tactics. In my presidencies, I've always tried to present my ideas privately, but consistently, to various groups with a stake in the outcome. I ask for their thoughts and probe any reluctance that they may have. I make my case and ask them to make theirs. The idea is to align our points of view as closely as possible without the inevitable drama that comes from a many-sided public debate. It is amazing and gratifying how smoothly such tactics can achieve agreement.

I have also always appreciated the importance of casual perception, of how I appear to others as I walk down the street. If we want collegiality and civility, then we must be collegial and civil. If we want energy and enthusiasm, then we must project energy and enthusiasm. That is part of the job, always. It won't do to be welcoming and cheerful at ceremonial occasions if we are habitually gruff and glum.

Of course, none of these lessons is easy. Academic administration is not an easy trade to follow. I even left out several practicums and precepts, like the importance of learning to sleep with your eyes open and without snoring.

But administration is rewarding and important. The faculty is not going to run admissions or see that meals are available to students or that the computers are secure. No one else is going to volunteer to provide students with transcripts, raise money, or handle the legal affairs of the university.

We administrators do all those things and more. Perhaps we can be seen as the logistical battalion. Without us, the more prominent missions of learning and service are impossible. And that, I have learned, at least for me, is its own reward.
Community-College Chiefs' Pay Lags Behind Presidents With Similar Loads

By ELYSEASHBURN

When Carl M. Kuttler Jr. became president of St. Petersburg College in 1978, the job's focus was academic. Almost three decades later, the St. Petersburg Times named him one of 10 people in the city to watch — not in education, but in business. Yes, business.

And Mr. Kuttler himself views his job as college president, entrepreneur, lobbyist, global ambassador, county leader, and fund raiser. So, in a way, he's someone to watch in a whole lot of fields.

"I used to sit in my office and wait for people to come to me," Mr. Kuttler says. "Now I'm away from my desk at least half the time."

As community colleges have matured, many presidents' jobs — especially at the largest colleges in the country — have grown to look a lot like Mr. Kuttler's. And their compensation has grown as well.

At the largest two-year colleges and college systems in the country, median total compensation now tops $250,000, according to The Chronicle's first comprehensive look at presidential pay at those institutions. And a handful of seasoned presidents, like Mr. Kuttler, make more than $350,000 a year. The highest-paid system president, Michael B. McCall, chancellor of the Kentucky Community and Technical College system, made $610,670 in 2006-7.

With about 80 percent of community-college presidents planning to retire within the next 10 years, there is likely to be increased competition for qualified candidates, and pay may rise quickly.

The Chronicle's survey also found that presidential compensation at community colleges isn't just about salary and retirement anymore. Like universities, many two-year colleges have begun offering their presidents housing and car allowances, deferred compensation, and an array of bonuses. For example, Mr. McCall's salary was only $286,000, but he received $134,460 in deferred compensation, a $57,200 bonus, and a $90,000 housing allowance.

Still, community-college presidents' compensation has not reached the level of that at four-year institutions. The presidents at the 68 largest two-year colleges, districts, and systems make much less than their counterparts at the 182 largest public four-year institutions in the country, according to The Chronicle's survey.
At those universities and four-year systems, median compensation is now almost $400,000 a year, $150,000 higher than at community colleges. Their pay also pales in comparison to the chief executives at private institutions — despite the fact that most of the two-year colleges are many times larger than the private four-year institutions.

Not long ago, the duties of presidents of public, private, and community colleges differed greatly, but now, as one president points out, "they're all converging."

Community-college presidents do not just have to worry about running technical-education programs and keeping the local chamber of commerce happy. Like all presidents, they are out courting million-dollar donors, lobbying the legislatures, and promoting economic development in their states.

"In general, community-college presidents are dramatically underpaid for what they do," says Narcisa A. Polonio, an expert on presidential compensation at the Association of Community College Trustees. "They've made some gains, definitely. But I think they're still far away from where they should be."

**Duties Have Changed**

In the 16 years that Sanford C. Shugart has been a community-college president, he has seen the role expand in every direction. But perhaps the biggest change has been the responsibility to bring in money.

Mr. Shugart's institution, Valencia Community College, in Orlando, Fla., has one of the largest endowments of any two-year college in the country. But Mr. Shugart says the $60-million endowment needs to grow to $500-million to keep improving the institution.

To help reach that goal, Mr. Shugart maintains a high profile in Orlando, and he plays host to at least one fund-raising event a month at his home. He also handles, on average, another four or five fund-raising events a month at other places. And he is involved in any negotiation involving a gift of $500,000 or more.

Mr. Shugart estimates he spends about 25 percent of his time raising money. About 25 percent is devoted to running the college, and another 25 percent is focused on outside partnerships, like those with local businesses, public schools, and state universities. The final quarter is spent on state politics in Tallahassee.

"When I go to Tallahassee, I may be speaking for the college at 10 a.m. and for [the city of] Orlando at 11 a.m. in front of a different committee," he says.

That's a shift from when he first became a college president. Then, he spent 60 percent to 70 percent of his time running the college and working with internal constituencies, like faculty and staff members. The job is much more like that of a four-year president than Mr. Shugart would ever have imagined 20 years ago.
Though he makes less than presidents at nearby universities, Mr. Shugart thinks he is fairly compensated for his expanding duties. At $388,692 in total compensation, he is one of the highest paid community-college presidents in the survey. "That's a lot of money to me," he says.

When his Board of Trustees tried to raise his pay several years in a row, he turned them down — telling them he would rather have more time off to write and spend with his four children. "I am very fortunate to have a very thoughtful, informed, and low-maintenance Board of Trustees," he says.

Keeping Pay Low

Nationally, boards feel significant pressure to keep presidential pay down. In many cities, the local community college and its leader are intensely scrutinized, and boards do not want to be seen as mismanaging taxpayer money.

*The Miami Herald* splashed a story across its front page in July 2006, when Eduardo J. Padrón, president of Miami Dade College, collected close to $1-million in retirement money while he was still working.

The deal was made possible by a Florida law that allows state employees to retire and collect benefits, then return to their jobs after 30 days if their employers are willing. Miami Dade College was. And the maneuver allowed Mr. Padrón to collect the $893,000 nest egg that had been accruing since he entered the state's deferred-retirement program five years before.

Mr. Padrón got the media attention, in part, because of his already substantial compensation. At $566,328 a year, his pay package is the second largest of any community-college president. He is also president of one of the largest colleges, with 160,000 students. "I think my board understands the value of my job and I am compensated fairly," Mr. Padrón says. "Many of my colleagues around the country are not."

Mr. Padrón does not have too much free time to enjoy his money.

His contract specifies that he needs to be prominent in national higher-education circles. As such, he serves on the boards of directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Those duties, along with running the college, keep Mr. Padrón at work from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. most days. His weekends also often belong to the college.

Though he says he feels well paid, he still makes $300,000 less than the highest-paid public-university president in *The Chronicle*'s survey.

And his institution, with the equivalent of about 45,000 full-time students, rivals the size of institutions like the University of Michigan (whose president is paid $743,151), the University of Florida ($726,849), and the University of Texas at Austin ($599,780).
Ms. Polonio, vice president for education, research, and board-leadership services at the Association of Community College Trustees, says trustees, faculty members, and local leaders often point to the differences between four-year and two-year institutions to justify paying community-college presidents less. But both types of institutions are complex and challenging to run, she says.

"If you're the head of McDonald's selling hamburgers and somebody else is the head of a pharmaceutical company selling medicine, your two jobs are very different," Ms. Polonio says. "But you're both still head, and you're compensated accordingly."

**Regional Differences**

The gap between what university and community-college presidents make varies greatly from state to state. Florida, for example, has some of the highest-paid community-college presidents in *The Chronicle*'s survey. Mr. Padrón at Miami Dade, Mr. Kuttler at St. Petersburg College, and Mr. Shugart at Valencia all made the top five.

Florida has a history of paying presidents well, in part because boards there are appointed. In states such as California, however, boards are locally elected, and faculty and staff unions usually field a candidate or two. When union-backed candidates land on a board, they are often skeptical about raising presidential pay. The state's colleges also have largely been isolated from the national market because they tend to draw most of their presidents from other California colleges.

As a result, many California presidents in *The Chronicle*'s survey are near or below the median pay for presidents nationwide, despite the high cost of living in that state. Even the chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, which has more students than any other district in the country, did not crack the top 10. The then chancellor, Darroch F. (Rocky) Young, made $310,295.

The strength of the faculty and staff unions also complicates the presidency in that state.

Philip R. Day Jr. learned that his first day as chancellor of the City College of San Francisco. Mr. Day arrived on the campus to learn that the staff was striking.

"Now, this is a labor town," Mr. Day says. "If somebody puts up a picket line, nobody walks across that line — not faculty, not elected officials."

Mr. Day negotiated a compromise within 48 hours, and he now sits down every three weeks with the leaders of the staff union for an 8:15 a.m. meeting that sometimes lasts several hours. He has a similar meeting with the faculty union every three weeks, and he says he is always available by phone. "I spend a lot of time with them compared to other CEO's, but it's worth it," he says.

Mr. Day attributes his 10-year tenure — the longest in the college's history — in large part to his relationship with the people who keep the college running. He also spends a lot of time with Bay Area business leaders and state lawmakers.
Mr. Day pushed, successfully, for state legislation that will eventually give colleges equal money for enrollment in for-credit and noncredit courses, which have historically been supported at about half the rate. The City College of San Francisco has more noncredit enrollments — in areas like remedial courses and English as a second language — than any other college in the state. But the legislation will benefit all 109 of California's two-year colleges.

"I think 10 to 15 years ago, college leaders were more willing to sit back and just let people do stuff," he says. "But the message has been given loud and clear that you're going to get what you deserve, and you're only going to get what you fight for."

At $403,441, Mr. Day makes more than any other president of a large California community college. His pay is a far cry from the $80,000 or so he made as president at Cape Cod Community College in the 1980s. But, he says, so are his skills.

"Do I feel guilty at all about being one of the highest-paid college presidents in the country?" Mr. Day asks. "Absolutely not."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP PAY AMONG COMMUNITY-COLLEGE PRESIDENTS WHO STEPPED DOWN IN 2006-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Richard G. Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gerald J. Lamkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE:</strong> Chronicle Reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many College Presidents Lack Written Employment Contracts

By PAUL FAIN

All college presidents technically hold employment contracts. But whether the terms of those contracts are spelled out clearly is a different story. One-third of public university chiefs do not have formal written agreements, The Chronicle found in a survey of 165 public universities where such documents are considered public information.

Some of the collected agreements (which are posted on The Chronicle's Web site) are extensive legal documents. For example, Lester A. Lefton, president of Kent State University, holds a 12-page contract with an eight-page attachment detailing his deferred compensation.

However, some contracts, including those at the University of Colorado at Boulder and the University of Missouri at St. Louis, are just brief letters of appointment from governing boards.

Several of the 56 presidents who hold no formal, written contracts — such as Daniel D. Reneau, president of Louisiana Tech University — were hired a decade or more ago, when such agreements were less common. Mr. Reneau has been president since 1987. Another common reason for the lack of contracts is that governing boards may prefer that presidents be "at will" employees, who serve at the pleasure of boards and can be easily fired.

Additionally, many boards may prefer to keep compensation details away from public scrutiny.

Several experts on presidential pay criticize the number of "handshake" contracts in higher education. They say written contracts provide stability to the volatile, high-pressure role of the presidency, which is increasingly seen as a corporate-style CEO position.

Frank L. Kurre, national managing partner of the higher-education and nonprofit division at Grant Thornton LLP, an accounting firm, says governing boards that follow "proper stewardship" will negotiate written employment agreements with their chief executives. "I think it's at least a best practice," he says.

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges agrees, recommending the use of presidential contracts in guidelines for trustees.

The reason some boards shy away from written contracts, compensation experts say, is fear that the details of presidential pay will be seized upon and criticized by faculty unions and the news media.
"Many people don't want to put it in writing," Mr. Kurre says. But he says governing boards should nonetheless use contracts to be "fiscally transparent."

**Job Security**

Boards that do not draw up contracts for their presidents are "behind the curve," says Raymond D. Cotton, a Washington-based lawyer who specializes in presidential compensation. Mr. Cotton worked on many of the contracts collected in The Chronicle survey and says written agreements bring stability to presidencies.

Lawyers and pay experts agree that presidents are driving the increased use of contracts. "They want some form of job security," says Patrick L. Clancy, a Washington-based employment and labor lawyer with Venable LLP.

Also important for presidents is having a clear description of their pay and benefits. Compensation packages have become much more complex in recent years, with many presidents now receiving deferred compensation, one or more bonuses, and various fringe benefits. A good contract can prevent conflict over what a president is owed, which can become a problem when the relationship between president and board goes sour.

**A Free Hand**

The value of presidential contracts is somewhat murkier for boards than for presidents.

Boards also want stability, and are typically looking for a decade's commitment from a new president. Mr. Cotton says a contract creates security. But he says some trustees believe that "if there's nothing written, that gives the board freedom to do whatever they want."

While most compensation experts agree that that is a mistaken assumption, some say it carries a whiff of truth. In many states, an "at will" employee can indeed be fired easily.

The University of North Carolina system has long steered clear of formal contracts with its president and chancellors. Jim W. Phillips Jr., chairman of the system's Board of Governors, says the practice gives the board a "freer hand" on many issues, including compensation and questions of "continued employment."

"I think that's a good thing for the public," he says.

However, Mr. Cotton says terminated presidents can challenge a firing even if there is no written agreement. For example, a discrimination lawsuit could allege that the employee was dismissed because of race or gender.

Also, a fired president could challenge the presumption that he was an at-will employee, arguing that some form of employment agreement was violated by the termination. That approach has varying potential for success, depending on case law in each state.
If a written contract is in place, a lawsuit is far less likely, lawyers say.

"It's much better to have a contract," says Howard S. Ende, a former general counsel for Princeton University, who is with the Princeton, N.J., office of Drinker Biddle & Reath.

But Mr. Phillips says the lack of contracts has never been a problem in North Carolina.

"In order to get quality people, the people we wanted, it hasn't been an issue," he says. "The university is better off, and the chancellor is not ill served."

The Fine Print

Contract lawyers also say that boards can still fire presidents who have written agreements. While most presidential contracts have terms of three or more years, some presidents have rolling agreements that are renewed on an annual basis. If a board wants to oust a president, it can wait until the contract is up and get a quiet presidential exit by not renewing the contract. But a problem-free departure depends on the contract’s details.

For example, Mr. Cotton points to the "defective" employment agreement held by John A. Fallon III, former president of Eastern Michigan University. The university's governing board voted in July to end the contract of Mr. Fallon, who was under fire for his handling of a student's murder on the campus. He had also clashed with the board on other issues.

Mr. Fallon's seven-page contract says he may be "terminated at any time by the board." But Mr. Cotton says the document gives Mr. Fallon enough wiggle room to challenge his firing in court. He did so last month, filing a civil suit alleging that he was "irreparably harmed by his precipitous and unwarranted termination."

The key to a good contract, lawyers say, is clarity and detail. As examples, Mr. Cotton points to the employment agreements held by presidents at the major public universities in Florida. When those documents were drafted, he says, some trustees and university administrators fretted about using detailed, explicit language about compensation and severance.

The result, however, is a better-informed public and no lawsuits, Mr. Cotton says.

"The earth hasn't crumbled in Florida."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATE-UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS WITH TOP TOTAL COMPENSATION, 2005-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Richard M. Freeland</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $2,887,785 in total compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $514,500 in salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $2,373,285 in benefits, including the present value of a long-term annuity retirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
payment to be received in the amount of $2,333,428

**Additional annual compensation from corporate sources:** None
* Mr. Freeland stepped down in August 2006.

2. **James P. Gallagher**
   Philadelphia University
   - $2,557,219 in total compensation
   - $2,510,983 in salary, including $2,210,983 in fully vested deferred compensation that accrued over five years.
   - $46,235 in benefits

**Additional annual compensation from corporate sources:** None
* Mr. Gallagher stepped down in August 2007.

3. **William R. Brody**
   Johns Hopkins University
   - $1,938,024 in total compensation
   - $1,492,220 in salary from the university, including $920,438 in deferred compensation
   - $298,144 from Johns Hopkins Health System, a nonprofit affiliate of the university
   - $147,660 in benefits from the university

**Additional annual compensation from corporate sources:** As much as $115,000 in annual pay for membership on the boards of Medtronic Inc. and Mercantile Bankshares Corporation, plus stock options and shares.
**NOTE:** Dr. Brody stepped down from the board of Medtronic Inc. in August 2007. Mercantile Bankshares was purchased by PNC Financial, and Dr. Brody is not a member of the PNC board.
DVC tries to protect image abroad

PLEASANT HILL: Dean travels to Indonesia, which sends many students to the U.S.

By Matt Krupnick

STAFF WRITER

Article Launched: 10/31/2007 03:05:27 AM PDT

A Diablo Valley College dean traveled to Indonesia this month to allay fears that the school's grade-changing scandal had diminished its reputation.

The trip by Krista Johns, dean of English and business, illustrated how important the country has become to DVC.

About 200 Indonesian students attend the school, representing about 10 percent of Indonesian students attending U.S. community colleges, according to the Institute of International Education.

International students pay significantly higher fees than California residents do, making them a financial boon to community colleges.

Johns said she made the special visit to the capital city of Jakarta after recruitment contractors said Indonesian parents were concerned the six-year-long scandal would prevent students from transferring to four-year schools.

"We're talking about someone sending a student thousands of miles and paying thousands of dollars," Johns said. "That's based on (a student's) ability to move on to a four-year school."

DVC has a reputation for sending students to top schools such as UC Berkeley and UC Davis, but the extensive cash-for-grades scheme raised concerns about the integrity of DVC transcripts. Nearly three dozen current or former students have been charged with felonies in the case, and California legislators said they intend to change state laws to prevent such scandals.

Some of the implicated students transferred to universities such as UC Berkeley, San Francisco State and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and one -- ringleader Julian Revilleza -- pleaded guilty in exchange for a year in jail.

Although no Indonesian students were accused of participating in the scheme, Johns said she explained in Jakarta that parents can help prevent scandals.
"When parents have very high expectations for their students, that can create some real pressures," she said. "I told them it was not possible to point fingers at domestic or international students, but there is something to be learned."

The Pleasant Hill school is not believed to have received inquiries from worried parents in other countries, Johns said. DVC has nearly 900 international students, one of the largest foreign community-college populations in the country.

Indonesian parents take such matters extremely seriously, said Michael Ross, a UCLA political science professor and expert on Southeast Asia.

"Americans often don't realize just how poor Indonesia is," said Ross, who spent time in Jakarta as a visiting scholar.

"For Indonesians to send their kids overseas is really quite prestigious and a meaningful step. It makes sense to me that they would closely monitor the U.S. schools."
Some Community-College Students Fall Through the Cracks in Their First Month

By ELYSE ASHBURN

Many new community-college students receive little or no attention from advisers in their first four weeks of class, even though those first weeks are key to helping students succeed.

Those findings, from this year's Community College Survey of Student Engagement, indicate that many students have barely made it through the door before they slip off their college's radar.

"The results are interesting and compelling and completely unsurprising," says Kay M. McClenney, the survey's director and a senior lecturer in the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas at Austin. "We know that there are an awful lot of students who are lost very early in the process."

The 2007 survey, which was released this week, for the first time attempted to determine exactly what services students need, but aren't receiving, in the first four weeks of college.

Among the most striking findings, more than a third of students said they had not completed any course-placement tests after a month in college, even though most colleges say they require all students to take such tests.

Some students are exempted from taking placement tests because of their SAT or ACT scores, but at most community colleges, far less than a third of students submit those scores. Rather, the survey indicates that students are slipping by in other ways.

The survey, commonly known as Cessie, also found that more than half of students did not discuss educational goals with an adviser in the first month and that about one-third did not attend orientation.

Those findings stand in contrast to mounting research showing that orientation and advising help students stay in college and do well. The findings also contradict what students say they want.

About 89 percent of students in this year's survey said that academic advising was important to them, and almost two-thirds said it was very important.

The lack of early advising may contribute to students' confusion later on. Last spring almost a quarter of community-college students surveyed weren't sure if they would return to college any time soon.
This year's Cessie used data from a three-year cohort made up of the colleges that participated in the survey in 2005, 2006, and 2007. This year's cohort includes more than 310,000 student from 525 colleges in 48 states, British Columbia, and the Marshall Islands.

The national data were released this week on the project's Web site (http://www.ccsse.org), though colleges received their institutional reports in the summer. Those individual results are also posted online, unlike the institutional reports from the National Survey of Student Engagement, which are confidential unless a university chooses to share them.

Inherent in the two-year colleges' openness is a commitment to improve, Ms. McClennen says.

Brookhaven College, in Dallas, for example, has started a workshop for faculty members that focuses exclusively on helping students in the first three weeks of college.

Professors are encouraged to assign short writing assignments, like a job description for the student's workplace. The assignment allows professors to gauge each student's writing ability early on and gives them a sense of the students' outside obligations.

"These colleges are confronting data that isn't what they want to see," says Ms. McClennen. "They're saying, 'Folks, we need to do something about this.'"
The darkly dressed hooded man - the one with the silver alien hanging from his neck and the deranged eyeball glasses that blinked on and off - suddenly began hurling objects into the crowd. Milky Ways, Starbursts, sticks of Orbit and Eclipse gum.

"I'm a black hole, and I'm going to evaporate away," shouted UC Berkeley astronomy Professor Alex Filippenko, flinging the candy faster and faster as students whooped and waved their hands in the air.

For more than a decade, Filippenko has repeated this annual ritual. He doesn't suck up everything in the room or look like the Oakland Raiders' most hard-core fans. But when it's time for his Halloween lecture, he is always a black hole.

There were about 500 people in Wheeler Auditorium on Wednesday afternoon. Although the airborne treats midway through the class caught many by surprise, the students are accustomed to the strange phenomena conjured up by their unconventional instructor, who was named professor of the year by a national foundation in 2006.

Filippenko, who has been teaching at UC Berkeley since fall 1986 and resembles an academic version of comedian Robin Williams, wears one of his 100 or so astronomy-themed T-shirts to each class. Every lecture begins with a different theme song from his collection, including "Champagne Supernova" by Oasis, "The Sun" by Maroon 5 and "Gravity Never Failed" by Orchestral Manoeuvres in the Dark.

Props can be coat hangers, basketballs, glazed doughnuts or orange balloons - anything that can help clarify the complex workings of a universe that still awes him.

"I'm a performer," Filippenko said.

He is also one of the world's most highly cited astronomers. He has received several major prizes and his research accomplishments have been documented in about 500 published papers. He and his team have developed a robotic telescope at Lick Observatory and have been credited with the discovery of more than 600 supernovas. Voted five times by students as the top professor on
campus, Filippenko has co-written an award-winning textbook and appeared in a number of TV documentaries.

How does he do it?

"I don't sleep as much as most people," he said. "And I'm sort of the boy who can't say no."

Last year, while he was working on a 96-lecture video series for the Teaching Co., he slept an average of three hours a night during the summer.

"What I'd really like is one of those machines like Hermione had in 'Harry Potter,' where you could be in two places at the same time and people wouldn't know you were in the other place," said the 49-year-old professor.

He sat in his Campbell Hall office the other day, surrounded by clutter. Among the decor: his children's drawings, a poster of the Virgo cluster, a dried piranha from the Amazon jungle, and dozens of loose tennis balls that can be enlisted as celestial beings when the need arises.

Filippenko is keenly aware that his 750 students don't have to come to Introduction to General Astronomy because the lectures for the class, aimed at freshmen and sophomores, are online.

"You have to somehow snare them," said Filippenko, who also offers star parties and bull sessions. "I try to attract their attention and hold it. One way to do that is a performance and wearing your passion on your sleeve."

When it comes to performing, the Halloween lecture is a classic of the genre. What better way to demonstrate the quantum-mechanical evaporation of black holes postulated by renowned physicist Stephen Hawking?

"Every lecture is really fun, but this was one of the more memorable ones," said freshman Eddie Lee, 18, said afterward.

"It's a gimmick," Filippenko said. "But it illustrates a point in a way that really makes it memorable for the students. I mean, here's this wacky Berserkeley professor dressed completely in black. I kind of look like the Unabomber."

One year, he accidentally grabbed his microphone and threw it into the audience along with the Halloween candy.

Filippenko tries hard to make abstract concepts accessible. Former student Heather Newman recalled a class in which he tied a doughnut to a string and swung it above his head to show how gravity kept the moon in orbit.
"I've never had a professor that comes close to him," said Newman, who took his class in 2001 and is now a graduate student in biophysics at UCSF.

She wrote one of the nomination letters for the big prize he won in 2006: professor of the year among doctoral and research institutions nationwide, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and administered by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Filippenko, who specializes in supernovas, active galaxies, black holes, gamma-ray bursts and the expansion of the universe, said he teaches about one-sixth of the students at Cal before they graduate. He never gets tired of it.

"The purpose is to illustrate some of the beauty and majesty of science, and the scientific process, to people who aren't science majors," he said.

Unlike most of his students, Filippenko was a "science nut from Day 1," playing with magnets in the sandbox and graduating to chemistry kits, electronic sets and microscopes before his parents bought him a telescope when he was 14.

Filippenko, who was living in Goleta in Santa Barbara County, took it outside and found two bright stars. He decided to check out a third before going to bed. It turned out to be a planet.

"I realized I had discovered Saturn," he recalled. "It illustrated to me the addictive thrill you'd get during discovery. If I could get such a rush from finding an object that was well known, how much better would it be to find something for the first time in the existence of humanity?"

Still, he planned to have a career in chemistry. "I was an accomplished basement chemist and I made explosives, just for the fun of it," Filippenko said. "Once, I blew myself up quite seriously."

Near the end of his freshman year at UC Santa Barbara, he switched to physics. But he still loved to see things explode.

During a lecture last week, he discussed a favorite topic - stars that completely destroy themselves. He told the class about a supernova whose 20th anniversary was celebrated in February. It used to be a typically bright star.

"And then it went KA-BLAAAAM," Filippenko yelled, throwing his hands in the air. "And it just blew itself to smithereens."

The astronomer lives with his wife and three children - a 14-year-old daughter, 11-year-old son and 11/2-year-old baby girl - in a house they rent in Piedmont. He travels often. A fanatical
follower of total solar eclipses, he will see his ninth in Mongolia in August and his 10th in Tahiti in 2009.

Even when he's in the Bay Area, his mind is often elsewhere. For astronomers - accustomed to thinking in terms of billions of light-years - "an exploding star within a couple hundred million light-years of us is just a stone's throw away." It's a perspective that can change one's concept of time in everyday life.

"If I'm driving to L.A., that's very nearby compared to Alpha Centauri, which is 4 light-years away," Filippenko said. "But it's still going to take me the better part of a day to drive there."
A 2-Year Start on the Future

Community colleges put renewed emphasis on helping their students succeed

By ELYSE ASHBURN

Community colleges pride themselves on their open-door policies. For decades, access and enrollment — especially of traditionally underserved students — were their key markers of success. But in recent years, lawmakers, accreditors, and the institutions themselves have begun demanding more. It’s no longer enough for community colleges to get students in the door. Now they must get more of them out the door with a degree or a ticket to a four-year university.

The shift has created a renewed focus on students. Community colleges across the United States are taking a hard look at what happens to students once they enroll. And they are experimenting with new teaching methods, better advising, and creative financial-aid programs to help more students succeed.

_The Chronicle_ spoke with four students who faced a variety of obstacles — poverty, poor academic preparation, the need to work full time — but managed to stay in college. They cited career counseling, financial aid, and nontraditional academic programs, but each also mentioned at least one professor who had been a mentor.

**Jolie Menghetti Rohde, 20**  
**Tulsa Community College, Tulsa, Okla.**  
Graduated: spring 2007  
What helped: financial aid, professors

Jolie Menghetti Rohde was working on construction crews and living in a garage two years ago when she enrolled at Tulsa Community College.

At 18, she’d been on her own for years. She had left home at 14, dropping out of school and essentially living on the streets before she ended up in juvenile detention. She returned home and attended school intermittently over the years, earning a high-school diploma through a state program for dropouts.

She then worked as a construction carpenter, but the work was sporadic and didn’t pay well. Soon she decided it was time for a more stable existence and figured that college was the answer.

"I failed everything in high school and always had to take summer school," she says. "And summer school was at TCC, so I knew about it."
Ms. Menghetti Rohde had also heard that financial aid might cover her college tuition. And since she actually read math and science books for fun, she figured she might have some aptitude for those subjects. So she enrolled at TCC.

She then walked there almost every day for the next three semesters, finishing her mathematics degree in a year and a half. She made top grades in just about every course she took.

"Academically, things were smooth," she says. "But getting used to college was a long process."

People were shocked to learn that she was living in a garage. Even at a college where about half of the full-time students qualify for federal grants, she was taken aback by the wealth around her. She couldn't afford to buy food some days, and she still lived in a world where people were just as likely to end up in jail as in college. But she bristled at the notion that she was somehow unfortunate.

"Yeah, you gotta go to the food bank, but at least there's a food bank to go to," she says. "Most people I know just feel bad for themselves. But they're in America. If you're in America, you can get financial aid and you can go to college."

She eventually found her place at Tulsa Community College. She hung out with international students, who, like her, were in a foreign environment. For the first time in her life, authority figures — in this case professors — also supported her. They told her she shouldn't stop at an associate degree, or even a bachelor's.

"When you look at people who are in a position to teach at a college, and they tell you, 'You can do this,' that's just so encouraging," she says.

Ms. Menghetti Rohde graduated this past spring and transferred to the University of Tulsa. There she's studying math in the hope of entering a graduate program in pharmacy. Her tuition, fees, textbooks, and most living costs for the next two years will be covered by a prestigious scholarship from the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation.

But the scholarship money hasn't come through yet. So Ms. Menghetti Rohde, who is now married, is living in public housing. But she can picture a world where she and her husband could own a house, maybe even one with a two-car garage.

***

Jaime A. Harris, 30
San Jacinto College, Pasadena, Tex.
Graduated: spring 1998
What helped: a professor, a hands-on program

Jaime A. Harris was born in Honduras and moved to the United States with his family when he was 6. Mr. Harris was the self-described black sheep of his middle-class family. He hated school, but he sure could work with his hands. So in his senior year of high school, he started studying diesel mechanics half-time at San Jacinto College.
In one of Donald Clayton's classes there, he met Rogelio Gonzalez, who had moved to the United States from Mexico when he was in high school.

Now the two are partners in a trucking business, which grossed $3.5-million last year. Mr. Harris speaks knowledgeably about tax write-offs, contractors, and the advantages of a minority-owned business. He's still pretty good with his hands.

He credits Mr. Clayton with training that talent. The professor taught Mr. Harris and his classmates to work on electronic diesel engines when most working mechanics still could fix only mechanical ones. When Mr. Harris graduated with a certificate in diesel technology, he found companies lined up to hire him.

But first came graduation day. Mr. Harris had an inkling that Mr. Clayton was a well-connected professor, but it became abundantly clear that day. "People flew in from Detroit, from all over," he says. One company trucked in air-conditioners to cool the campus shop for a graduation barbecue.

"All that just to watch 20 people graduate," Mr. Harris says. "That's how influential he is."

Mr. Harris went on to work for several years as a diesel technician at Cummins Inc., an engine manufacturer. He topped out at about $50,000 a year and decided to go to work for himself. He and Mr. Gonzalez started a diesel-repair company and eventually moved into trucking. They hope to build the business, J.A. Harris Trucking Inc., in Houston, into the largest minority-owned trucking company in the country.

Mr. Harris still counts Mr. Clayton as one of his three role models, right alongside his father and his former boss at Cummins.

"If I hadn't gone to San Jacinto," Mr. Harris says. "I'd probably be working at Home Depot or something."

***

Dara M. Taylor, 28
Anne Arundel Community College, Arnold, Md.
Graduated: spring 2002
What helped: a professor, an engaging program

A white car rounds a curve and stops beneath an overpass. A guy casually strolls across the road above and drops a drug-filled bag through the car's open sunroof. It's a simple scene, shot at a distance, as if it could be almost anywhere in the United States.

It's from the documentary *Opiated: Life Beneath the Eyelids*, which Daryl W. Gonder, a professor at Anne Arundel Community College, plans to show in his filmmaking class this year. The documentary was filmed and produced by one of his former students, Dara M. Taylor, which is telling in its own way.

---

Mr. Gonder started the film program at Anne Arundel in 1998. Just eight years later, MovieMaker magazine named it one of the best two-year programs of its kind in the country. Ms. Taylor is one of its successful graduates.

By her own account, she "didn't do so well" in high school and assumed that college was not an option. But a year working in a minimum-wage job persuaded her to try a few classes in the fall of 1999. She chose an introductory film class with Mr. Gonder.

"I had always been interested in movies," she says. "And I was like, 'Oh, it's a film class. It's going to be easy.'"

Of course, she was wrong. (One of Mr. Gonder's favorite student critiques said he "eats slackers for lunch.") "His class was the only one that I really loved, and it really changed my perspective on the academic world," Ms. Taylor says.

She went on to take more classes with Mr. Gonder, including several in film and one in English. In 2002 she graduated with an associate degree in general studies and transferred to the visual-arts program at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County. Just before graduation, she decided to apply to graduate school at the School of Visual Arts, in New York City.

She used Mr. Gonder as a reference. And she got in.

Ms. Taylor finished her master's program this past spring and now works as a video artist at a design agency in New York. And this fall she is doing a minitour for screenings of her documentary.

***

Corey W. Campbell, 28
Miami Dade College, Miami, Fla.
Still in college
What has helped: financial aid, a professor

Corey W. Campbell dropped out of high school. He worked dead-end jobs — lots of them. He's been married and divorced. He's the father of a little girl.

He gave the Army a try. He's been evicted — lots of times. He's taken out payday loans to get by. He's even lived in his car.

Something had to change, he decided in 2005, a year after his father died in an accident and a few years after his mother died.

Mr. Campbell was too old to be an orphan, but that didn't change how alone he felt. "I just had to make a decision about life," he says. "And I decided to go back to school."

He had earned a general-equivalency diploma a few years back, so that fall he enrolled at Miami Dade College. He started working at The Catalyst, the student newspaper at the college's Kendall
campus, and decided that journalism was the perfect fit. Two years later, Mr. Campbell is editor in chief and freelances for *The Miami Herald*'s "Neighbors" section. He is also captain of the college's debate team.

Mr. Campbell says he wants to set an example for his daughter, who lives in Arkansas with her mother. Still, he almost had to drop out this semester. Even working two jobs, at a local bookstore and at Brooks Brothers, he couldn't make his rent. So he went to the dean of students and explained his situation. The dean, Armando Ferrer, was able to give Mr. Campbell a $900 institutional grant to supplement his federal aid.

"I know that Corey has done a lot for the college, and we had some additional money and could help him during a time when he had additional needs," Mr. Ferrer says.

The money kept Mr. Campbell enrolled, but he still had to move, and now he has an hourlong bus trip to the campus. The newspaper's adviser, Merwin Sigale, has encouraged him to keep up his studies. But it's hard, he says.

His experience illustrates just how fine the line is between success and failure.

"Someone was talking to me the other day and said, 'Corey, there's like a little black cloud hanging over your head,'" he says. "And I said, 'Yeah, I even took meteorology, and I still don't know how to make it go away.'"
The Chronicle of Higher Education

Getting Students Through Remedial Math Is a Constant Struggle, but This College Keeps Trying

By DEBRA E. BLUM

Walter Hunter, who teaches a remedial algebra class at Montgomery County Community College, brought scissors to class last month so his students could cut their textbooks in half.

The five-pound, 1,000-page tomes were unwieldy, Mr. Hunter explained, and the bulging pages made it difficult for students to write notes and solve equations in the book. With glee, students cut away, slicing off the second half of the book, which was not used much in the class anyway.

James Schneck, a second-year student who failed beginning algebra when he first took it last spring, appreciated the move, which has given him easy access to the section of the book that provides answers to practice questions.

"I didn't even know there were answers buried in there before," says Mr. Schneck, 19. "It's a big help to have the answers to check your work. These little things make a difference."

Indeed, says Mr. Hunter, it is these kinds of minor details — lightening the mood of the classroom with a book-cutting break or familiarizing students with their books and study guides — that go a long way in helping students succeed in remedial-math classes.

As at many two-year colleges around the country, the pass rate among Montgomery County Community College students who take remedial-math classes, which cover material students are typically expected to master in high school, is much lower than school officials would like. Of the roughly 1,350 new students at Montgomery County who took a remedial-math class in the fall of 2005, the latest year for which data are available, only about half passed. And over time, plenty of students will never pass: One student of every four who took beginning algebra at Montgomery County in the fall of 2000 had not earned a passing grade in the course four years later. Students were either still repeating the class, had dropped it, or had left the school altogether without passing the class or earning a degree.

To improve on those records, Montgomery County is experimenting with different course offerings, teaching methods, and academic-support services — all designed to move students more quickly and smoothly through remedial math.

"It is critically important to focus resources on the needs of students in that first term," says Kay M. McClennen, a senior lecturer at the College of Education at the University of Texas at Austin, who directs an annual survey of community-college students. "Studies show that students who enroll in and successfully complete remedial courses in their first term are more likely to graduate or stay on track to graduate than any other population of students, including those who were never in remedial education."
Most colleges have two or three levels of remedial math, also known as precollege or developmental math, starting with arithmetic and ending with beginning or intermediate algebra. The courses are typically pass-fail and not for credit, and are a prerequisite for credit-bearing math courses and most degree-granting majors and programs.

Students are required to take such courses based on their scores in placement tests taken after admissions. Remedial math, along with other developmental-education programs in reading and writing, is considered a core offering at nearly every two-year college, meant to provide a bridge to college-level work for underprepared students.

But for many, remedial-math courses in particular are a hurdle they can't clear — and that means plenty of stalled or thwarted college plans.

Estimates vary, but many community-college educators and experts say that on average between 40 percent and 70 percent of new students entering two-year colleges around the country place into remedial math.

But what college officials and observers find so distressing is not so much the number of students who must take remedial-math classes, but the number of students who fail them.

"There are students taking these courses three, four, five times before they can pass them, and many who drop out, give up before they do," says Barbara S. Bonham, coordinator of the higher-education graduate program at Appalachian State University and a consultant to colleges on remedial education. "That's incredibly disturbing, and demonstrates that something is wrong — with the curriculum, with the teaching, with something or a combination of things that must be identified and addressed at every institution."

No national statistics exist to track pass rates, but among a group of 27 two-year colleges participating in a foundation-supported effort to improve graduation and transfer rates, called Achieving the Dream, the data are grim.

Fewer than one-quarter of the students at the 27 colleges who placed into a remedial-math course in academic 2002-3 had finished their precollege math requirements three years later. Many students at the institutions were already considered at risk for not being on track to graduate — because they came from low-income families, for example. However, low pass rates in remedial education appear to be a national phenomenon, not one limited to certain colleges or specific student profiles.

Montgomery County, in the suburbs of Philadelphia, has pockets of poverty, but it is mostly an affluent area. The main campus of the community college here is green and sprawling, occupying former farmland and converted barns. Among the 17,000 or so students taking courses for credit, one in five is a minority-group member, and more than one-third are first-generation college students. Some 13 percent of students graduate within three years of enrolling, while another 30 percent transfer to other colleges within that time. Of the roughly 3,500 new students each year, about 60 percent must take remedial math.
Largely spurred by its concerns about pass rates in remedial math, and seeking to lift its graduation rate as high as 23 percent by this spring, Montgomery County Community College signed on to the Achieving the Dream program earlier this year. It is now one of 83 two-year colleges working with grants from the Lumina Foundation for Education, the Heinz Endowments, and other groups to help more students succeed in school.

This semester at Montgomery County, nearly 2,000 students are enrolled in fundamental arithmetic or beginning algebra, 17 of whom are taking Mr. Hunter's new course, which combines the two.

The course, which is being run as a pilot program, is a direct result of what college officials learned during focus groups with students and staff members last spring. Students expressed frustration with the pace of remedial courses: When classes moved too quickly, they risked falling behind; when classes moved too slowly, they felt bored and disengaged. Students also said it was discouraging to spend a semester or more in classes for which they earned no credit.

Mr. Hunter's new course addresses some of those concerns: It condenses two semesters of classes into one, and offers a medium-paced course that focuses on algebra but includes some review of arithmetic when needed.

"I wouldn't say I was totally ready for algebra, but I wouldn't have wanted to waste too much time — a whole semester in basic math — either," says Joshua DuBois, 19. He worked for a year after graduating from high school, then started at Montgomery County this fall. "When [Mr. Hunter] says things like reciprocal, or something, I am, like, oh yeah, I remember that, and then we move on."

To step up the pace for other students, Montgomery County for the first time offered two-week refresher courses in math this past summer. The courses were intended to give students taking arithmetic in the fall a leg up, and to allow others who had scored relatively high on the placement test to skip basic math and move right into beginning algebra.

Montgomery County has also expanded its academic-support services this year, to include a new peer-tutoring program intended to help students class by class. The institution's learning-assistance lab has long offered general tutoring sessions for students taking remedial math. The new program, in contrast, has tutors behave more like teaching assistants — attending classes and holding weekly help sessions designed around that specific course. The tutors are students or former students who have recently passed developmental-math courses, along with some higher-level math as well.

"I'm right there in the classroom so it makes seeking help much less frustrating and time-consuming," says Earl McCard, 25, a student tutor who took beginning algebra a few years ago and is scheduled to earn a liberal-studies degree in the spring. "I can connect with them, too. I had some of the same difficulties, and I know how to get past the initial problems and frustrations."

Mr. McCard, who is taking precalculus this semester, works in one of Mr. Hunter's basic-math classes. Mr. Hunter says that besides the practical help Mr. McCard provides with course work,
the tutor helps create a more positive atmosphere in the classroom. And, the professor says, Mr. McCard is a valuable role model.

"Students see that it's all right to take more than two years to graduate," Mr. Hunter says. "That's critical because many of these students are also taking developmental courses in English and reading, and there's little chance they can do all that and finish in two years. We don't want to lose people just because they are discouraged."

That doesn't seem like a real worry for now in Mr. Hunter's new hybrid course. The 17 students are a spirited mix of older returning students and younger ones fresh out of high school. Some are there because they didn't learn enough math in earlier schooling; others say they have simply forgotten the material and need to get back up to speed.

Mr. Hunter peppers his classes with humor and helpful tips. After assuring his students during a class last month that when they have mastered algebra, they "will live happily ever after," he tossed out a mnemonic for the concept they were working on: order of operations.

"Please excuse my dear Aunt Sally," he wrote on the marker board, before putting up the equation: \((8)(-2)-6=\_
\)

The phrase is meant to remind students that math equations are read not left to right, but according to a set of rules that explain which calculations to perform in what order — parentheses first, then exponents, then multiplication, division, addition, and, finally, subtraction.

Students seemed to follow along as Mr. Hunter eliminated the parentheses first, multiplying 8 and -2, then subtracting 6, to get the answer: -22. But things got a bit trickier when a later problem involved a fraction: \(6(-3) +(5)(-2)/3-10=\_
\)

Mr. Hunter reminded the class that with fractions, problem solvers must first simplify the nominator and the denominator, using the order of operations in each case, and then take care of the division last. But the introduction of the fraction was making Audrey Nurse-Gregg, a fortysomething woman who's back in school to become a physician's assistant, a little anxious. After class, she explained that her anxiety about math has kept her from succeeding before. She took a beginning algebra class last spring, but dropped it midsemester.

Here, though, she is overcoming her phobia in large part, she says, because Mr. Hunter and her classmates seem sympathetic.

In the middle of working on the fraction equation in front of the class, the professor stopped, looked at her and said: "Audrey, is that all right? You look confused."

"Yes," Ms. Nurse-Gregg responded, smiling. "I am really unhappy with this problem at this moment."

Other students laughed quietly along with her, and the class continued working on the equation. More slowly this time.
Young Librarians, Talkin' 'Bout Their Generation

Up-and-comers discuss what will change and what needs to change

By SCOTT CARLSON

Most people are familiar with the stereotype of librarians. They are twenty- or thirtysomethings, with tattoos, cat's-eye glasses, and vintage clothes, schmoozing with famous authors, and playing DJ at parties in Brooklyn.

Wait, that's just the stereotype in *The New York Times*. Last summer the newspaper declared young librarians hip — and, in the minds of some librarians, actually reinforced the other stereotype: that older members of their profession are reclusive bookworms and cranky old ladies.

Whether young librarians are hip or dowdy doesn't matter. What matters is what they think about the future of the library, particularly at academic institutions.

Libraries are facing a series of immense challenges: the explosion of information, a rapidly changing technological environment, shrinking budgets, pitched battles over copyright, a new world of information literacy, and continuing deficiencies in old-fashioned literacy.

On top of it all, academic libraries face a crisis of graying leadership. Young librarians, hip or not, will eventually be the people dealing with these issues.

This month *The Chronicle* contacted eight librarians under 40 and asked them a series of questions about the future of their profession, including: What will happen to the book? How will battles over copyright play out? What do you love and hate about librarianship? Here is what they said:

**What is the future of the book?**

Well, its longevity speaks to its usefulness. It won't go away for certain purposes, like sitting down to read a novel. It won't be replaced in my lifetime, certainly — people enjoy books. But when you start to look at scholarly inquiry, people are relying less and less on them. The University of Michigan has a papyrus collection; the papyrus hasn't gone away, but the ratio of papyrus to books is pretty low. Going forward, I think the ratio of books to electronic resources will similarly be skewed, so that a lot of the scholarly inquiry will be taking place online. Of course, there are copyright issues to be worked out and other sorts of long-term preservation issues.

A book is a wonderful storage medium when you are dealing with centuries' time frames. You can open it and still read it, if it's properly housed. I don't think we have solved those issues with
the electronic medium. But I think that is definitely where it's going — the books will be less used on a daily basis and more like that papyrus at the University of Michigan. You might still refer to [books], but you might be working with digital versions more often.

Will there be a reference desk — yes or no?

I personally hope so. I think there is a lot being done to offer a really broad range of digital reference services, and I have a lot of personal and professional interest in that. My system right now is doing a lot of experimentation with Skype to provide reference services that use chat and video at the same time. Those experiments are absolutely crucial to offering users a range of different access points. A lot of people in the future, even 40 years hence, may find that face-to-face personal contact is the way that they want to have their information help, but at the same time, if we don't offer another range of services, we are going to lose people.

What information services will be performed by libraries in the future, and what information services will be performed by companies and nonprofit groups?

As we look at what is going to be performed by academic libraries and what is going to be performed by Google and Amazon, just to put two companies out there, what Google can do better than so far any library can do is that search function, that discovery function. Although we have been working on it for years with metasearch and federated search engines, we just have not gotten anywhere near to what Google can do.

So I think what would be in our best interests is to drop the fight, to let Google take over that, and instead to focus on the value add that only we can do, which is that in-depth research that we can do with our users. Only we, the librarians here, know what our faculty expectations are. We know what our faculty research interests are. We can see a whole bunch of new articles and books coming through the door, and we can say, This would be great for Professor Smith or Professor Jones.... Amazon and Google just aren't going to get to that level.

Should the relationship between libraries and publishers change? If so, how?

Of course it should change. When you do the numbers, librarians have this incredibly insane, crazy amount of purchasing power. Who buys all those scholarly publications that scholars create in order to get tenure? Libraries do. Who else? No one — or almost no one. So libraries are this big dumb market for a lot of this material, and I only mean dumb in that I don't think they're aware as a homogenous group of just how powerful they are.... You wouldn't think then that they would be on the butt end of all of these terrible, terrible licensing agreements with any nonprint information that they buy from publishers, and yet they still are. I think what we are seeing is publishers of print are trying hard as hell to not make as much print anymore, because paper costs real money and electrons don't.

We're only seeing a couple really clueful people enter the marketplace, and we're seeing a lot of the same tired old you'll-buy-it-because-you've-always-bought-it business model.... I'd like to see libraries take more of the upper hand in terms of buying some of these products that reflect the actual purchasing power they have as a giant buyer of things, and less of, "Oh, my gosh, Elsevier gave us this contract, ... but it's got all these restrictions, and what can we do?" Well,
tell them to stuff it, and tell them to come back with a better contract. Theoretically we have the power to do that.

**Does the library profession need to diversify and draw from different populations?**

Yes. I was part of the American Library Association’s Spectrum initiative to bring in new professionals from underrepresented groups and different cultural backgrounds. That has been a major force in bringing diversity to the profession, but I still think that we need to extend more, to reach out more. That’s part of how we stay relevant, because of the cultural competencies people bring when they are from different backgrounds. That only helps us provide better services to people, because you may understand some of the needs and the best practices to get to these people.

**What is one thing that libraries are doing right, and one thing that libraries are doing wrong?**

One thing that we are doing right is a shift more toward a user-centered approach, where we are really trying to understand not just how we fit into something limited, like writing a term paper, but where we fit in the 24-hour life cycle of the students. If a student comes in during the day, they are going to have certain needs, and if they come in at night, they are going to have different needs, and at the beginning of the semester it’s different than the end of the semester. Really looking at it with an anthropological approach, which the University of Rochester has done, is a way that libraries are shifting.

One thing I don’t think we do well is play nice with others, or really partner with other service units on campus.... I think we need to understand how we play with housing, how we play with the bookstore, auxiliary services, and all these others — admissions, the registrar — and how we can maybe help them succeed with their mission as well.

**How well did your library-science education prepare you for the field today?**

I don't have a library-science education. I have an IT background. My undergrad was in English, but I have been employed as an IT person since then and have slowly made my way to libraries. I'm not sure that library science is as technically demanding as it should be for the challenges that new graduates will face. That was a discussion that was on a number of e-mail groups that I'm in. We face recent graduates who don't have any experience in relational database design, and we expect them to understand how to choose a technology plan or choose technologies that will control their ability to serve users, and there is not enough knowledge in libraries to build that.

We've done no research and development in libraries — over the past 18 months there has been a blossoming of research and development, but before that we outsourced that to vendors.... We've outsourced the innovation. And because we only compare libraries against libraries and not against Google or anything else, we think we're doing great. And Google says, "Yes, they are," then takes all of our users. We need some very, very skillful new blood.
What will the academic library look like in the future?

The academic library in the future is going to be a continuation of what we see now, with more multimedia integration. It won't be limited to just providing access to materials but also providing access to the creation of different types of materials. For instance, it's not just providing access to DVDs, but maybe providing access to video cameras or DVD burners in order to make digital storytelling, or maybe going so far as to provide games or immersive environments in virtual worlds.
More Online Enrollments

More students than ever are taking courses online, but that doesn’t mean the growth will continue indefinitely. That’s the takeaway from the Sloan Foundation’s latest survey, conducted with the Babson Survey Research Group, of colleges’ online course offerings.

With results from nearly 4,500 institutions of all types, the report, “Online Nation: Five Years of Growth in Online Learning”, found that in fall 2006, nearly 3.5 million students — or 19.8 percent of total postsecondary enrollments — took at least one course online. That’s a 9.7-percent increase over the previous year, but growth has been slowing significantly: last year, the jump was 36.5 percent.

But compared to the growth rate for enrollment overall (1.3 percent), the report notes, the online sector is still rapidly expanding. Most of that expansion is happening where online classes are already being offered.

“The number of new institutions entering the online learning arena had definitely slowed [by last fall]; most institutions that plan to offer online education are now doing so,” the report’s authors wrote.

The institutions surveyed seem to believe that the most important reason for offering online courses is to improve student access, while the top cited obstacles to more widespread online offerings are student discipline or study habits, followed by faculty acceptance.

The survey focuses solely on what it classifies as “online” courses: those offering 80 percent or more of their content over the Internet. As a result, trends in so-called “blended” or “hybrid” courses, in which students occasionally meet in person with their professors while also receiving considerable instruction online, are not covered in the report.

The importance of online courses varies widely depending on the type of institution. Public universities, for example, view online education as much more critical to their long-term strategies than private or even for-profit institutions. And not surprisingly, two-year colleges have shown the most growth, accounting for a full half of online enrollments over the past five years:

Four-Year Growth in Students Taking at Least One Online Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment, Fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, Fall 2006</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Compound Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>258,489</td>
<td>566,725</td>
<td>308,236</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>335,703</td>
<td>686,337</td>
<td>350,634</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>130,677</td>
<td>170,754</td>
<td>40,077</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community colleges</td>
<td>806,391</td>
<td>1,904,296</td>
<td>1,097,905</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>71,710</td>
<td>160,268</td>
<td>88,558</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance to online strategies is broken down in the following chart:

% Saying Online Education Is Critical to Their Institutions’ Long-Term Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>Private For-Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even if online growth can’t go on at this pace forever, most institutions still see room for increasing enrollments:

% Saying They Expect Online Enrollments to Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doctoral/Research</th>
<th>Master’s Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Associate’s Specialized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expecting increase</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tables From “Online Nation: Five Years of Growth in Online Learning”*

The study also found that most growth was expected at institutions that are the most “engaged” — that is, “currently have online offerings and believe that online is critical to the long-term strategy of their organization. These institutions, however, have not yet included online education in their formal strategic plan.”

**Andy Guess**
From the Los Angeles Times

Professor makes a case for faculty-student romance

UCLA's Paul Abramson argues that colleges shouldn't restrict dating by consenting adults -- provided grades aren't involved.

By Larry Gordon
Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

October 22, 2007

In the volatile mix of academia and sex, UCLA psychology professor Paul R. Abramson says he is trying to light a torch for liberty.

Abramson is sharply criticizing his own employer and colleges nationwide that have adopted restrictions -- and, in a few cases, outright bans -- on romances between faculty and students.

Of course, sexual harassment should not be allowed and no one should supervise or give grades to a romantic partner, says Abramson, who has taught at UCLA for 31 years. But those concerns should not restrict the right of consenting adults to have a non-exploitative relationship, he argues in a new book.

The rights to romance and to choose whom to love are as basic as the freedoms of speech and religion, Abramson writes in "Romance in the Ivory Tower: The Rights and Liberty of Conscience" (MIT Press). A university that suppresses such a choice "tramples the very nature of freedom itself," he declares.

Readers looking for sexy material will be disappointed by his 172-page volume, unless they get turned on by constitutional law and copious references to Jefferson, Madison and the 9th Amendment. There are no steamy scenes of stolen kisses in library cubicles.

But the book has steamed some critics.

University leaders say anti-dating rules protect students, usually graduate students, who may feel their education is at risk when a relationship ends. As expected, the book has triggered a few smirky comments about its author, who teaches courses on human sexuality and whose previous writings tackled such topics as abuse and incest, the spread of AIDS and the history of sexual freedom.

Conservative critic Dinesh D'Souza called Abramson's constitutional arguments a "legal absurdity" and wrote in his online column that the UCLA professor "is certainly entitled to cruise the bars of Los Angeles if he wants to. I just think he should leave his copy of the Constitution behind."

Salon.com, in a blurb that set off a blistering online debate about the classroom and the bedroom,
suggested that Abramson might be "a campus Casanova in his own right."

To that, Abramson reacted wryly during an interview at his campus office. "I'm 57 and have three kids and two grandkids. If I'm the campus Casanova, then the campus has a lot of problems," said the professor, who has longish graying hair, a goatee and an earring.

Abramson concedes that his personal life was complicated in his 20s but says he has been a staid suburban soccer dad for the last two decades. Thrice divorced, he is married to a 51-year-old neonatal nurse who has never been affiliated with UCLA.

He points out that he has not had a romance with anyone at UCLA for 20 years, although he said he had serious relationships with two former undergraduate students nearly 30 years ago. One was 13 years his senior, and the other, whom he eventually married, was five years his junior. He met them in his classes but did not date them until later, he said.

Too many people have an unrealistic stereotype of campus love, he said. "The picture of it is the older professor and Suzie Coed. I'm sure such things happen, but the greater likelihood are people of similar ages, with similar interests, going for the same music and movies," like a 27-year-old assistant professor and a 24-year-old graduate student who later get married, he said.

Abramson's book began as a reaction to regulations adopted by the UC regents in 2003; they didn't ban such hookups but declared that professors should avoid romantic or sexual relationships with students for whom they have "or should reasonably expect" to have teaching or supervisory responsibility. That includes students interested in a subject within the professor's expertise -- a definition that Abramson finds overly broad. Sanctions range from written censure to dismissal.

The rules were adopted, amid some debate, partly in reaction to a sexual harassment allegation at UC Berkeley. Its law school dean, John P. Dwyer, resigned in 2002 after a student charged that he fondled her when she passed out from heavy drinking. The dean said the encounter was consensual.

The fact that the Dwyer case was cited to support the rules shows that campus leaders were more concerned about lawsuits than anything else, Abramson alleges.

"Eliminating civil liberties to punish a small number of transgressors is hardly the answer," he writes.

To allay legal fears, he suggests an alternative: All faculty and students would read and sign a release (a "love contract") that would warn about the power differences and favoritism that can arise from faculty-student dating. They then would promise, as in a medical release, not to hold the school responsible if the romance goes sour.

(Abramson previously raised that idea in a 2003 opinion piece in The Times. In his book, he recalls how a Times editor at the time accidentally forwarded, and then profusely apologized for, an internal e-mail memo jokingly calling him a "pervert.")
UC Santa Barbara political science professor Gayle Binion, who helped draft the 2003 UC policy when she headed the systemwide Academic Senate, said it was partly intended to shield UC from liability.

But more important, she said, most of the faculty thought it was "good policy" since students may consent to an affair but not grasp the potential consequences even if they sign a release. "If the relationship goes awry, it is the student who is going to suffer," Binion said, citing instances of graduate students who then drop out.

Such relationships are "not terribly uncommon at the graduate student level," but probably less frequent and more "under the radar" now than during the free-wheeling '70s and early '80s, she said. Still, the rule "not only makes parents more secure when they send their kids to UC, it puts the faculty on notice," Binion said.

Abramson overstates his case about restrictions on freedom, according to Binion. Limits on dating are common in many workplaces, she said, and academia "is kind of late coming to it."

Since 2003, a handful of cases of possible faculty violations of the policy have been formally reviewed, according to UC spokesman Brad Hayward. No professor has been dismissed, although a few were disciplined with warning letters that are considered confidential personnel matters, he said.

So what do students think? Reaction is mixed.

Dianne Tanjuaquio, a vice president of UCLA's undergraduate students association, said she agrees with Abramson that the rules are too harsh in keeping entire departments off-limits. "We are adults at an elite university. Something as broad as that is very restrictive on our personal freedoms," she said.

But Oiyen Poon, president of UC's systemwide student association, supports the regulations, explaining that a teacher in the same department could harm a student's career even if they never shared a class. Without the rules, "those issues could get extremely sticky when a student is trying to earn a degree in a timely fashion," she said.

In 1995, the American Assn. of University Professors adopted a statement that calls sexual relations between students and faculty who supervise them "fraught with the potential for exploitation." Anita Levy, its associate secretary for academic freedom and tenure issues, said Abramson's arguments might find some support on campuses, but she doubted any rule changes nationwide would occur.

Abramson said he is often asked how he would react if his middle daughter, who is preparing for college, dated a professor in the future. "It's within the realm of possibility, but it's much more likely she would meet a 22-year-old teaching assistant," he said. "If that's who she wants to be involved with, that's who she gets involved with."
Press Telegram

Parents oppose LBCC fee hike
By Kevin Butler, Staff writer
Article Launched: 10/23/2007 09:09:14 PM PDT

LONG BEACH - More than 25 parents appeared at a meeting of the Long Beach City College Board of Trustees Tuesday to ask that it reverse a decision to raise fees for college-provided preschool.

At a meeting of the five-member body, several parents told board members that the fee increase, scheduled to take effect in the spring semester, would force them to cut back the hours that their children spend at the college's two-campus Child Development Center or withdraw from the program entirely.

"We know (the center) is cheap but to go that high for the next semester is just outrageous," said Heather Sanchez, whose cost for sending her child to the center for 12 hours each week will increase from $42 to $90 under the new fee structure.

Currently, parents who are students, faculty or staff at LBCC are charged $3.50 per hour for a child, Community members not affiliated with LBCC are charged $4 per hour.

With the fee increase, both groups will pay an identical fee of $7.50 per hour.

The fee increase is needed because the program currently is operating at a deficit, said Gary Scott, LBCC dean of creative arts and applied sciences.

The college collects only $460,000 in revenue to help offset the program's about $1 million cost, Scott said.

"That is really what the college was concerned about, this encroaching on the general fund," he said.

But parent Liz Ryan Murray, whose 3 1/2-year-old child attends the center, said that the fee hike would price the LBCC program far above those provided by other area community colleges.

Murray said that the fee hikes may cause people to drop out, reducing revenue rather than increasing it.

She has proposed instead that the college gradually increase the fee to about $4.70 per hour.

"I'm taking them at face value that they have a large deficit," she said. "I want to be part of the solution. I just think that this is just so excessive."
Scott said that the college is sensitive to the possibility that some families may decide to reduce hours or leave the program, but that the college doesn't receive the state subsidies for child care programs that other area community colleges do.

Several trustees at the meeting asked LBCC Superintendent-President Eloy Oakley to prepare a report on the issue for the next board meeting.

The trustees also heard an update of a proposal to place a bond proposition on the Feb. 5 ballot asking voters for additional money for construction projects.

Trustees, who have not yet voted on the proposal, indicated they would like to continue to explore that option.

"I have a strong interest in moving ahead," said Trustee Tom Clark.

The board is facing a Nov. 9 deadline to move to place the item on the Feb. 5 state primary ballot.
CSU students not ready to make nice - and they don't have to
Bob Egelko, Chronicle Staff Writer
Thursday, November 8, 2007

The 417,000 students at California State University's 28 campuses are expected to be civil to one another, the university says in its policy manual.

It sounds innocuous - but a federal magistrate says it's an unconstitutional restriction on speech when the policy is used to investigate or discipline students, such as the College Republicans whose members stomped on two flags bearing the name of Allah during an anti-terrorism rally at San Francisco State last year.

"It might be fine for the university to say, 'Hey, we hope you folks are civil to one another,' " U.S. Magistrate Wayne Brazil said last week at a hearing in his Oakland courtroom. "But it's not fine for the university to say, 'If you're not civil, whatever that means, we're going to punish you.'"

Brazil said he would issue a preliminary injunction barring the university from enforcing the civility standard in any disciplinary proceeding. He said the university can continue to enforce another rule disputed by the College Republicans - prohibiting intimidation or harassment - but can use the rule to punish students only for threatening someone's health or safety, and not merely for offensive statements or conduct.

The ruling, which has not yet been issued in writing, was a victory for conservative legal organizations that have filed suits around the nation challenging colleges' speech codes.

Most of those codes were adopted in the 1980s and '90s and prohibit what the schools described as hate speech - expressions that are abusive or demeaning to various racial, ethnic, sexual or religious groups. Opponents, who have often included the American Civil Liberties Union as well as religious conservatives, say the codes amount to censorship and an attempt to stifle debate.

In one case, a federal judge in Pennsylvania in 2003 struck down a college code that prohibited "acts of intolerance that demonstrate malicious intent." Another judge in 1989 overturned a University of Michigan code forbidding speech or conduct that "stigmatizes or victimizes an individual" based on race, religion, sexual orientation or other characteristics.
Similar provisions in Stanford University's code, outlawing words or symbols that convey "direct and visceral hatred or contempt" for people because of their status, were declared unconstitutional by a Santa Clara County Superior Court judge in 1995.

"Universities routinely use policies like (the California State University policy) to suppress Christian and conservative speech," said attorney David Hacker of the Alliance Defense Fund, a Christian nonprofit law firm that represents the San Francisco State College Republicans. As a result of Brazil's ruling, he said, "all students are more free to express their ideas."

Christine Helwick, chief counsel for the state university system, said the university should be able to comply with the ruling by clarifying its policy.

"It was never our intent that a charge of incivility would constitute a basis of discipline," she said. "We will reform our code to make that clear. . . . Our code doesn't disallow unpopular speech."

At the anti-terrorism rally in October 2006, members of the College Republicans stepped on flags representing the militant organizations Hamas and Hezbollah, each with Allah written on them in Arabic. A student later complained that the organization had engaged in "actions of incivility" and had tried to incite violence and create a hostile environment.

School officials interviewed witnesses and referred the dispute to a panel of students, faculty and staff, which held a hearing in March and found no violations of university policy. But the College Republicans said in their lawsuit in July that the investigation, and the existence of a civility code that might be used against future demonstrations, chilled their freedom of expression.

University lawyers argued that the civility policy was merely a goal, not a disciplinary standard, and that students and organizations could be disciplined only for violating specific rules against harassment or intimidation.

But Brazil, at a hearing Oct. 31, noted that the student's complaint of incivility was one of the bases of the investigation and that the San Francisco State student handbook specified that campus organizations could be held responsible for members' violations of university policies.

The goals of a university include promoting "respectful and reasoned discourse," said Brazil, a former college professor. "But the First Amendment permits disrespectful and totally emotional discourse."

Hacker said the plaintiffs would proceed with the case to make sure that the policy is rewritten and that nothing unfavorable appears in the students' files. He said they also seek damages for violations of their rights.
UCI ending lucrative transfer agreement

The university's extension program no longer will accept $500 from a for-profit school for each student referral, citing a possible breach of ethics.
By Tony Barboza, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer
October 16, 2007

The continuing education branch of UC Irvine is ending an agreement in which it receives $500 for every student it refers to an online for-profit university, citing the appearance of an ethical breach.

Several officials with higher education associations have criticized the arrangement, saying it blurs the line between giving advice and marketing.

FOR THE RECORD:
UCI continuing education: An article in Tuesday's California section about an agreement in which Capella University paid UC Irvine Extension $500 for every student it referred to the online for-profit school said that UC Santa Cruz received payments from Capella. Although it has an agreement that its extension credits will transfer to Capella, UC Santa Cruz does not receive payments. —
For the last five years, UCI Extension has had an agreement with Minneapolis-based Capella University in which the online school accepts UCI's continuing education students and their UCI credits into several graduate programs in exchange for the referral fee.

Capella, which has enrolled 36 UCI students, has paid the university $12,000, according to UCI, which did not tell students it made money when they enrolled at Capella.

Gary Matkin, UCI's dean of continuing education, said the money was used to market students' eligibility to transfer to Capella in the extension program's quarterly catalog, on its website and through letters sent to students. Matkin, who set up the arrangement in 2002, said, "Everything we did was perfectly legal, straightforward and in the best interests of our students.

"People are misconstruing this as somehow being, if not illegal, unethical, so we're just going to stop."

Critics say incentive-based agreements such as that between UCI and Capella are unethical because they turn college counselors into salespeople.

"This is basically a finder's fee or a commission paid by one institution to another for qualified leads that pan out financially," said Barmak Nassirian, associate executive director of the American Assn. of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers in Washington, D.C. "It's a
problem when an institution ends up having a financial stake in where a student enrolls."

In a written statement, Capella spokesman Michael Walsh characterized the referral fees as "tuition-sharing payments" to offset UCI's costs for marketing his school's programs.

UCI set up the deal to ensure that students were aware that they could use their continuing education credits toward a graduate degree at Capella, Matkin said.

Most extension students are working adults who already have college degrees, although nearly anyone can enroll if they meet class requirements.

Capella's payments to UCI, first reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, came to light after Jeffry La Marca, 49, of Rancho Santa Margarita, a former student at UCI Extension, filed a public records request for letters and e-mails between UCI and Capella in his unrelated lawsuit against the for-profit school.

After The Times asked questions about the arrangement, Matkin announced the school would end the arrangement by Oct. 31. Matkin said he planned to place $12,000 from the extension program's budget into a scholarship fund for needy students.

Three of the eight University of California campuses that have extension programs -- UCI, UC Santa Cruz and UC Berkeley -- have credit-transfer agreements with Capella, said Chris Harrington, a spokesman for the UC president's office. Santa Cruz does not receive payments. Berkeley, which set up an arrangement similar to UCI's in 2004, has not received any per-student fees because no one taking a class eligible for referral has transferred.

Berkeley also is ending the program because of the public perception of ethical problems, said Ann Guy, spokeswoman for the university's extension program.

Capella is the only for-profit university that has paid transfer agreements with UC schools, Harrington said.

Congress banned incentive-based recruiting by colleges that receive federal student aid in 1992. In 2001 and 2002, the Department of Education found several universities had violated the ban.

In 2002, the Bush administration published regulations that created exemptions that allowed such payments to be made in certain situations. The Department of Education, which has authority over those exemptions, has not reviewed UCI's agreement with Capella and would not comment on its legality to outside parties, said press secretary Samara Yudof.

The concern over UCI's agreement with Capella comes after congressional and state investigations found that some loan companies were providing payments, gifts and perks to universities and officials that steered student loan business their way.

Some critics, such as Nassirian, said UCI's relationship with Capella is similar because it involves deals carried out without students' knowledge and both agreements involved schools "treating the student as an asset to be traded upon."
Capella has "numerous" credit-transfer programs, mostly with community colleges, Walsh said, but he declined to disclose how many involve per-student payments.

UCI Extension has credit-transfer agreements with three other institutions: Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences in Claremont, and two online programs offered by the University of Wisconsin at Platteville and the Florida Institute of Technology. Capella is the only school that pays UCI.

"Because it is for-profit, I felt that it was logical for us to seek some sort of compensation for the marketing we are doing for them," Matkin said, "so we asked them to give us money for the number of students that matriculated to them."

David Hawkins, director of public policy and research for the National Assn. for College Admission Counseling, in Alexandria, Va., said such arrangements appeared to be in conflict with the association's ethical code, which bars member schools from accepting payments for placing or recruiting students. UCI is not a member, but UC Berkeley is.

"Any time you reduce the basis of recruitment to cash kickbacks or commission sales, the ability and willingness of recruiters to act in the interest of students goes downhill quickly," he said.
The Chronicle of Higher Education

IN BRIEF

Miami Dade Evaluates Courses for 10 Key Skills

By ELYSE ASHBURN

Miami Dade College believes there are 10 key skills that graduates should take away with their diplomas. They are things such as the ability to communicate clearly, think creatively, and analyze data. So the college is examining every single one of its 2,000 or so courses to make sure that no student can go through an entire degree program without being exposed to all 10 skills. The college then plans to test graduating students on what they have learned.

The massive undertaking is an answer to the increasing push from lawmakers, businesses, and college leaders themselves to ensure that students leave higher education able to function in the modern work environment. The U.S. Department of Education, which has been pushing colleges to track student learning, has applauded the effort.
A Glance at the October Issue of *Community College Review: Community Colleges and Bachelor's-Degree Attainment*

By JASON M. BRESLOW

Studies indicate that attending a community college can reduce a student's likelihood of earning a baccalaureate degree by as much as 20 percent, leading many experts to conclude "that the rational choice" for students desiring a bachelor's degree is to start college at a four-year institution, says Barbara K. Townsend, a professor of higher education at the University of Missouri at Columbia. Yet most researchers "do not typically consider many of the legitimate reasons students have for enrolling in the community college," she writes, and tend to criticize such institutions unfairly.

Students choose community college for reasons besides lower costs and geographical convenience, says Ms. Townsend, Simply because some "have the academic background and ability to attend a four-year school ... it does not necessarily follow that they should do so."

Some students, for example, are drawn by the welcoming feel of community colleges, she writes, with their small classes "taught by faculty members who are focused on teaching and learning." Some students need such a "nurturing learning environment" to succeed, she writes, "and thus may have difficulty after transfer or may even choose not to transfer to another academic environment." The failure of some transfer students to thrive, she adds, may also reflect personality traits such as lack of motivation, rather than some sort of ineffectiveness on the part of community colleges.

"Researchers need to stop selling community-college students short by implying they make a poor choice" in deciding not to attend a four-year institution, Ms. Townsend argues. "Students who start at the community college are typically making a rational choice, and perhaps even the best choice in light of who they are at the time of entry," she says.

In addition, she writes, with many community colleges beginning to look more like four-year institutions through the development of honors and baccalaureate programs, "researchers may become less critical of student decisions to attend the community college," she writes. More important, she says, such developments "may result in a greater baccalaureate-attainment rate" at community colleges.

The article, "Interpreting the Influence of Community College Attendance Upon Baccalaureate Attainment," is available to subscribers or for purchase through Sage Publications.
'Achievement gap' for minorities must be eliminated
By Jim Boren / The Fresno Bee
10/21/07 02:45:04

Educators have long known that student test scores follow the poverty line. You can go to any city in America and determine where the upscale neighborhoods are just by looking at test results. You don't need a Chamber of Commerce representative or a real estate agent explaining a community's economic differences.

Want to know where the middle-class neighborhoods are? Find the schools with middle-of-the-pack test scores. The pattern follows for the lowest test scores. Those will be from schools in the poorest neighborhoods.

There are some exceptions, where a school or two will score better or worse than its economic circumstances would suggest, but demographics dictate results for the vast majority of schools.

The educational establishment has tried to attack this problem, although the improvements in student performance in poor neighborhoods have only been slight. But there is a related issue that's just as disturbing. It's the "achievement gap" in which white students score higher than minority students no matter what their economic circumstances are.

It's a touchy issue

That means that poverty isn't the only reason for disparity in student performance. This raises the race issue in student performance, and society still isn't comfortable talking about it.

But the California Department of Education says standardized test scores vary on the basis of race, even when taking into account the economic circumstances of students. Poor white students score better than poor Hispanic and African-American students, according to the California Department of Education.

More troubling for educators is that white students who are economically disadvantaged score about the same as Hispanic and African-American students who are not economically disadvantaged. So there is more to this issue than poverty.

State Schools Superintendent Jack O'Connell is on a mission to find out why there are such disparities in educational results in California classrooms. He's trying to determine if Hispanic and African-American students have the same access to a quality education as white students:

☐ Are the best teachers in minority schools or are they assigned only to white schools?
☐ Are there the same educational expectations of minority students as there are of white students?
☐ Are all the best education practices at all schools or are they only in schools that already have high test scores?
☐ Do minority schools have the same equipment, computers and quality of school facilities as white schools?
O'Connell said the achievement gap is unacceptable if California is going to have a quality work force, especially considering how competitive the global economy has become. "It is time that we willingly and openly discuss, examine and change this disconcerting fact," O'Connell said in a statement from his office. "We know that all groups of students can learn to high levels, so we must address those things that are holding groups of students back."

O'Connell is sponsoring an Achievement Gap Summit next month in Sacramento to discuss the problem. He also is having his statewide council of education advisers working on this issue, and the group will make recommendations at the summit.

'Right thing to do'

O'Connell deserves credit for pushing this issue, especially considering that he could be running for governor in 2010. Raising an issue as sensitive as the underperformance of Hispanic and African-American children won't make points with some groups. But it's the right thing to do.

Every student deserves an opportunity to learn and the school system must find out why there is such a disparity in test scores among racial groups. Then action must be taken to fix the problem. But it can't be done in the traditional way that the education establishment does it -- throwing money and unproven programs at a problem just to say something is being done.

One of the biggest problems in public education is that teachers get whip-sawed around with every education fad that comes along. They say they don't mind education reform, but they are tired of being reformed every year. How can you expect a program to work when a "better" one comes along a few months later?

Figure out why there's an achievement gap and then use the best information available to resolve it. O'Connell is on the right track. But he will need a lot of help to change the way California's children are educated.
A Dozen Teaching Tips for Diverse Classrooms

By PIPER FOGG

For the majority of community-college professors, teaching is the most important part of their jobs. And it’s not easy. Community-college students are a diverse bunch but often face a particular set of challenges. Many entering students are not prepared for college-level work. And while some students plan to transfer to competitive four-year colleges, others struggle to complete remedial courses. Some students commute long distances, and many have jobs or families. In one class, a teacher may face an 18-year-old who is fresh out of high school, a single mother who works part time, and a first-generation college student who doesn't speak English well.

Community-college students require teachers who are engaging, creative, responsive, and energetic — and who understand their students' needs. Professors have to be up on the latest teaching methods, know which of them work for their students, and be flexible enough to change when something isn't working. Here are a dozen tips — many from seasoned professors — for those just starting out, or for veterans who want fresh ideas.

1. Remember that your students are freshmen and sophomores.

One trap new faculty members fall into in their first jobs out of graduate school is to harbor inflated expectations, says Robin D. Jenkins, director of the Writers Institute at Georgia Perimeter College. "One new instructor in my department, for instance, asked students to write four lengthy essays during one 75-minute period," he says, "because that's the sort of thing she'd been expected to do in her graduate courses."

Mr. Jenkins advises new teachers to look at what their more-experienced colleagues are assigning, and to check out their syllabi. Even better, take them to lunch, he says, and pick their brains. "We all want to have the appropriate amount of rigor in our classes," he says, but that doesn't mean piling on the work when students aren't ready for it.

2. While setting realistic expectations is important, you must also share them with your students.

If you are a stickler for grammar, let it be known on Day 1, advises Delaney J. Kirk, a professor of management at the University of South Florida at Sarasota-Manatee. Tell students if you give grace periods for assignments or if you will not tolerate tardiness. "Have a rationale so the policy is seen as reasonable," says Ms. Kirk, the author of Taking Back the Classroom: Tips for the College Professor on Becoming a More Effective Teacher (Ti-berius Publications, 2005). After explaining your philosophy, take time to learn what students expect of you as well: Teaching is a two-way street.
3. Take advantage of the technology-training courses your college offers, but don't feel pressured to use technology for its own sake.

Sample everything that interests you, find the applications that best fit your teaching style, and try to incorporate them into your teaching. Just because your college offers fancy technology with a big "wow" factor doesn't always mean it will help you. "Experiment with what works for you," says Georgia Perimeter's Mr. Jenkins. "Feel free to ignore the rest."

4. Look at the whole experience — including the syllabus, the textbook, and the classroom from your students' perspective.

Are the books affordable or easy to find in the library? Is the classroom comfortable? Are assignments well spaced? It pays to think like your students, says Ellen J. Olmstead, an English professor at Montgomery College, in Rockville, Md., who was the 1999 Carnegie Foundation Community College Professor of the Year.

5. Consider keeping a teaching journal.

Verna B. Robinson, a professor of English at Anne Arundel Community College in Maryland, says it's a great way to keep track of your experiences, including successes and failures, challenges, aspirations, inspirations, expectations, and, yes, complaints.

6. Be mindful of the pressures on students, some of whom have families, jobs, or long commutes.

Use the Internet, for example, to make course material, assignments, and feedback available online, so students can log in any time from home.

7. Know what services are available at your college to help struggling students.

It's great if your college offers tutoring, English-language help, or career counseling, but they're useful only if students actually use them. Distribute a handout at the start of the term and approach individual students if they seem to need a hand. Have a counselor come and introduce himself or herself to the class.

8. Make sure students understand why the subject matter of the course is worth learning, and how it relates to the real world.

If you get students invested, they will put in more work, says Richard L. Faircloth, a biology professor at Anne Arundel. Mr. Faircloth, who teaches anatomy, asks students to find a topic in current events that relates to the week's assignment and write a short essay on why the topic is relevant in everyday life.

"I've always found these aha's that occur outside of class, when we've learned something in class, help to reinforce it," says Mr. Faircloth. Expanding students' media diets, he says, helps them find those everyday connections. It also gives them fresh perspectives and "gets them out of their little circle of e-mail and their circle of cellphones and text messaging."
9. Encourage your students to give you feedback on your teaching.

Anne Arundel's Ms. Robinson suggests passing out index cards midway through the semester and asking students what they would like to see more of and less of. Or ask students to grade you in one or two areas of your teaching. "Students appreciate being asked," she says. Listen to what they have to say and try to incorporate their reasonable responses.

10. If you are concerned about plagiarism, consider increasing the load of in-class work, such as problem sets and essays.

You will learn quickly who is struggling, and it helps procrastinators and those who might otherwise turn work in late, says Tiina Lombard, an associate professor of English at Miami Dade College. It also teaches students to work better under pressure.

11. Develop at least one assignment that requires each student to meet with you, one on one, in your office.

The meeting could be devoted to reviewing an essay or homework assignment. Then use that time to discuss the student's progress and answer any questions. "You will be amazed at how beneficial even a brief face-to-face meeting can be for you and the student," says Ms. Robinson.

12. Identify at least one quality you appreciate in each student, and keep it in mind every time you come in to class.

"It'll make you smile when you walk in to the classroom and look around at everyone," says Ms. Olmstead, of the English department at Montgomery College.
A Dozen Teaching Tips for Diverse Classrooms

By PIPER FOGG

For the majority of community-college professors, teaching is the most important part of their jobs. And it's not easy. Community-college students are a diverse bunch but often face a particular set of challenges. Many entering students are not prepared for college-level work. And while some students plan to transfer to competitive four-year colleges, others struggle to complete remedial courses. Some students commute long distances, and many have jobs or families. In one class, a teacher may face an 18-year-old who is fresh out of high school, a single mother who works part time, and a first-generation college student who doesn't speak English well.

Community-college students require teachers who are engaging, creative, responsive, and energetic — and who understand their students' needs. Professors have to be up on the latest teaching methods, know which of them work for their students, and be flexible enough to change when something isn't working. Here are a dozen tips — many from seasoned professors — for those just starting out, or for veterans who want fresh ideas.

1. Remember that your students are freshmen and sophomores.

One trap new faculty members fall into in their first jobs out of graduate school is to harbor inflated expectations, says Robin D. Jenkins, director of the Writers Institute at Georgia Perimeter College. "One new instructor in my department, for instance, asked students to write four lengthy essays during one 75-minute period," he says, "because that's the sort of thing she'd been expected to do in her graduate courses."

Mr. Jenkins advises new teachers to look at what their more-experienced colleagues are assigning, and to check out their syllabi. Even better, take them to lunch, he says, and pick their brains. "We all want to have the appropriate amount of rigor in our classes," he says, but that doesn't mean piling on the work when students aren't ready for it.

2. While setting realistic expectations is important, you must also share them with your students.

If you are a stickler for grammar, let it be known on Day 1, advises Delaney J. Kirk, a professor of management at the University of South Florida at Sarasota-Manatee. Tell students if you give grace periods for assignments or if you will not tolerate tardiness. "Have a rationale so the policy is seen as reasonable," says Ms. Kirk, the author of Taking Back the Classroom: Tips for the College Professor on Becoming a More Effective Teacher (Ti-berius Publications, 2005). After explaining your philosophy, take time to learn what students expect of you as well: Teaching is a two-way street.
3. Take advantage of the technology-training courses your college offers, but don't feel pressured to use technology for its own sake.

Sample everything that interests you, find the applications that best fit your teaching style, and try to incorporate them into your teaching. Just because your college offers fancy technology with a big "wow" factor doesn't always mean it will help you. "Experiment with what works for you," says Georgia Perimeter's Mr. Jenkins. "Feel free to ignore the rest."

4. Look at the whole experience — including the syllabus, the textbook, and the classroom from your students' perspective.

Are the books affordable or easy to find in the library? Is the classroom comfortable? Are assignments well spaced? It pays to think like your students, says Ellen J. Olmstead, an English professor at Montgomery College, in Rockville, Md., who was the 1999 Carnegie Foundation Community College Professor of the Year.

5. Consider keeping a teaching journal.

Verna B. Robinson, a professor of English at Anne Arundel Community College in Maryland, says it's a great way to keep track of your experiences, including successes and failures, challenges, aspirations, inspirations, expectations, and, yes, complaints.

6. Be mindful of the pressures on students, some of whom have families, jobs, or long commutes.

Use the Internet, for example, to make course material, assignments, and feedback available online, so students can log in any time from home.

7. Know what services are available at your college to help struggling students.

It's great if your college offers tutoring, English-language help, or career counseling, but they're useful only if students actually use them. Distribute a handout at the start of the term and approach individual students if they seem to need a hand. Have a counselor come and introduce himself or herself to the class.

8. Make sure students understand why the subject matter of the course is worth learning, and how it relates to the real world.

If you get students invested, they will put in more work, says Richard L. Faircloth, a biology professor at Anne Arundel. Mr. Faircloth, who teaches anatomy, asks students to find a topic in current events that relates to the week's assignment and write a short essay on why the topic is relevant in everyday life.

"I've always found these aha's that occur outside of class, when we've learned something in class, help to reinforce it," says Mr. Faircloth. Expanding students' media diets, he says, helps them find those everyday connections. It also gives them fresh perspectives and "gets them out of their little circle of e-mail and their circle of cellphones and text messaging."
9. Encourage your students to give you feedback on your teaching.

Anne Arundel's Ms. Robinson suggests passing out index cards midway through the semester and asking students what they would like to see more of and less of. Or ask students to grade you in one or two areas of your teaching. "Students appreciate being asked," she says. Listen to what they have to say and try to incorporate their reasonable responses.

10. If you are concerned about plagiarism, consider increasing the load of in-class work, such as problem sets and essays.

You will learn quickly who is struggling, and it helps procrastinators and those who might otherwise turn work in late, says Tiina Lombard, an associate professor of English at Miami Dade College. It also teaches students to work better under pressure.

11. Develop at least one assignment that requires each student to meet with you, one on one, in your office.

The meeting could be devoted to reviewing an essay or homework assignment. Then use that time to discuss the student's progress and answer any questions. "You will be amazed at how beneficial even a brief face-to-face meeting can be for you and the student," says Ms. Robinson.

12. Identify at least one quality you appreciate in each student, and keep it in mind every time you come in to class.

"It'll make you smile when you walk in to the classroom and look around at everyone," says Ms. Olmstead, of the English department at Montgomery College.
Peter Schrag: UC admissions: Slouching toward affirmative action?
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Any plan to change the undergraduate admissions system at the University of California is likely to bring charges that it's yet another politically correct attempt to reinstitute race preferences. That applies especially to reforms that de-emphasize grades and test scores.

A set of major revisions now proposed by BOARS, UC's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, will be no exception. It would make more high school graduates eligible for consideration for UC but end the virtual guarantee of eligibility that students with high grades and test scores – those in the hypothetical top 12.5 percent of California high school graduates, many of them Asians – now enjoy.

Only those in the top 4 percent in their respective schools would still be guaranteed a place in the system.

Yet complex as they are, the proposals and BOARS' analysis of the flaws of the existing system are buffered with enough reasoning to be worth the debate, if not the backlash that could follow if they're adopted.

The UC admissions system is now a two-step process: (1) achieving eligibility for some UC campuses, though not necessarily Berkeley, UCLA or San Diego, on the basis of a combination of SAT or ACT test scores and grades in the UC-required "a-to-g" high school courses, and (2) "comprehensive review" of an eligible applicant's entire record by the campuses to which he or she applies, from grades and test scores to extracurricular achievements, community service and handicaps overcome.

The board, said BOARS chairman Mark Rashid, an engineering professor at UC Davis, would like to loosen the "prefilter" now imposed by the eligibility requirement and put more weight on the comprehensive review of each applicant at the campuses to which the student applies.

There would still be minimum requirements – completion of the 15 "a-to-g" courses – English, math, science, social studies, etc. – that UC demands, a GPA of 2.8 or higher in those courses and the SAT Reasoning Test, formerly the SAT I.
But the SAT II subject-matter tests would no longer be required. Since the SAT I was revised to include writing and more substantive math items, UC believes, scores on the SAT II tests contribute little additional information in predicting whether an applicant will be successful at the university.

At the same time, BOARS says, because a large percentage of poor, Latino and black students don't take the SAT II tests, that requirement alone – not grades or test scores – has shut out a large percentage of those groups from the pool of eligibles. The largest disqualifying factor among students taking the "a-to-g" courses is students' failure to take the SAT II tests.

Moreover, says Rashid, the current guarantee of eligibility for students with a combination of high grades and test scores adds almost nothing in practical terms. Students who are guaranteed eligibility for UC but aren't admitted to the campuses to which they apply are bumped to a campus – inevitably Riverside or Merced – where there is space. But almost nobody takes those offers.

"By inviting a broader pool of prospective students to apply and be evaluated under comprehensive review," Rashid says, "campuses can make a better and more fair determination of academic merit by looking at all of the students' achievements in the context of their particular schools and personal circumstances.

"This is what our selective campuses do now when they choose among eligible students; every applicant should get the same opportunity."

BOARS calculates that without the SAT II requirements many more students would be UC eligible. The existing system, Rashid maintains, denies the campuses the opportunity to choose students who might contribute more than those admitted now.

Obviously, elimination of the SAT II requirement doesn't mean that thousands more applicants will be admitted. But it would enlarge the pool from which campuses can choose. And it's here that the plan becomes vulnerable to criticism and dispute.

Leaving aside suspicions of bad faith by admissions officers – that in applying the more squishy criteria of comprehensive review, they'll pursue diversity and overlook competence by giving blacks and Latinos preferences, either consciously or otherwise – the system will still find it tougher to justify its decisions.

When hard numbers – tests, grades – are used at least to define eligibility for the pool from which campuses choose, decisions can always be defended with "objective" facts. That those numbers sometimes don't mean much doesn't make the alternative criteria any easier to defend. And, of course, the numbers do mean something. There may not be much difference between 650 and 700 on an SAT math test, but there surely is between 500 and 750.

In the decades before (and just after World II), the Ivy League and other elite colleges downplayed tests and grades in order to pick the "whole man," meaning white shoe WASPS from the right social backgrounds. Comprehensive review may never become the black-brown version of that, but UC could still have a hard time persuading the skeptics.
UC panel urges eligibility change to cut guaranteed admissions
Tanya Schevitz, Chronicle Staff Writer
Thursday, November 1, 2007

A key faculty committee is recommending that the University of California dramatically reduce the number of high school seniors who are guaranteed admission to its campuses, a cornerstone of the state's landmark 1960 Master Plan for Education.

The committee's proposal stems from concerns that UC's current method of determining student eligibility is too rigid, making it unfair to some students. The proposal would make changes so only the top 4 percent of graduating seniors would be guaranteed a seat - down from the current 12.5 percent.

The state's Master Plan promises that every California student meeting eligibility requirements will get a seat somewhere in the UC system's nine undergraduate campuses.

But members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, a systemwide faculty committee, believe the guarantee works to the disadvantage of some students - mainly those in rural and inner-city high schools that do not offer all the college preparatory classes required by UC and that do not have enough counselors to properly guide students to take the required courses and tests.

The proposal also would eliminate the requirement that students take two SAT II subject exams to be eligible for the UC system. It would also make a technical change to modify the minimum grade point average.

The proposal is in its early stages of review, but committee chairman Mark Rashid, an engineering professor at UC Davis, believes the move could raise standards by eliminating those seniors who currently slide in by doing the minimum work to be eligible.

"There would be a slice of students ... that previously enjoyed a guarantee who would no longer be guaranteed a seat in the system," he said.

Under the state's 1960 Master Plan, UC establishes student eligibility by using an equation based on courses, grades and tests. It is designed so the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates statewide are eligible to attend UC.
Under the committee's proposal, only students in the top 4 percent of their high school would be guaranteed admission to a UC campus. Everyone else, including the remaining 8.5 percent who are currently promised a seat, would have to compete for a slot.

The new system would require students to be evaluated individually by each campus they apply to. Those not accepted would no longer automatically be given a slot at a UC campus with available seats, as is now the practice.

Rashid said that some students who may have worked hard and deserve a UC education are currently not eligible because of the very rigid technical requirements of eligibility. For example, he said, some didn't take the exact courses required by UC and others didn't take the two SAT II subject tests required.

The committee's proposal could widen the applicant pool by as much as 30 percent he said.

"There are many students who are ineligible because of technical reasons," he said. "One of the reasons for this proposal is to make these students visible to UC."

Faculty leaders on the campuses were reluctant to talk about the proposal because it is still under review by their members. But Linda Bisson, the UC Davis representative for the Academic Council, said eliminating the guarantee is worrisome to many.

"There are many of us, me included, that directly benefited from the Master Plan for Higher Education and know its value to the state as well as to the students," she said. "The state budget crisis is a real one, and we know that too - there is strong concern that the state's promise to citizens of a seat in a classroom for all eligible students will morph into the promise of a bed in a cell in prison for all eligible criminals."

The proposal by the committee is now being debated by the faculty and is expected to be voted on by faculty leaders as early as December and forwarded to the UC Board of Regents next year.

UC Regent John Moores, who has been actively involved in UC admissions issues, said he had not heard anything about the proposal.

"If true, it would be very disturbing," he said.
UC, CSU fees up more than U.S. average, way over inflation rate
Tanya Schevitz, Chronicle Staff Writer
Tuesday, October 23, 2007

California's two public university systems raised student fees this year well above the national average for state-supported campuses, according to the College Board's annual pricing report.

The 10-campus University of California system increased the cost for undergraduates by 9.7 percent to about $7,494 this year, and the 23 campuses of the California State University system raised fees by 10 percent to about $3,521 annually. The figures do not include expenses such as room, meals and books.

The national average increase was 6.6 percent - to an average of $6,185 this school year. The national inflation rate, meanwhile, was only 1.96 percent.

There has been a rapid increase in the price of an education at public universities at the same time state appropriations have fallen, said economist Sandy Baum, a senior policy analyst for the College Board, said Monday.

Public colleges have increased their prices by an average of 4.4 percent in the past decade, compared with 1.9 percent in the decade of 1977-1987.

At private four-year institutions, tuition and fees grew by $1,404, or 6.3 percent, to an average of $23,712 this year, the report says.

Stanford University, one of the nation's top private schools, increased costs by 5.46 percent to $34,800 this school year - about $1,800 more than last year.

UC spokesman Brad Hayward said the fee increases are necessary to maintain and improve the quality of instruction, expand student mental health services, increase financial aid and help raise faculty and staff salaries closer to market rate.

Patrick Lenz, CSU's assistant vice chancellor of budget, said CSU remains cheaper than comparable institutions and that the increases over the past three years have averaged six percent.

He said the system is underfunded by the state by $77 million.

Robert Shireman, executive director of the nonprofit Project on Student Debt in Berkeley, said the University of California does a good job of letting students and their families know how much they will be expected to pay based on their family income and provides more financial aid than other state systems.
"They do make an effort to make sure that if fees are going up there is an increase in financial aid," he said.

While costs have been rising faster than the rate of inflation, the College Board report says, many students pay less because of financial aid. According to the report, the increase during the past decade in grant aid - money that students do not have to pay back - covered about half of the increase in the average cost of tuition and fees at a public institution. But the net price of college is still rising much faster than inflation, Baum said.

E-mail Tanya Schevitz at tschevitz@sfchronicle.com.
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Community college funding measure isn't popular at UC, CSU
Tanya Schevitz, Chronicle Staff Writer
Monday, November 12, 2007

A ballot measure adding an estimated $300 million a year in guaranteed state funding to California's public schools and community colleges may get opposition from an unlikely quarter - the University of California and California State University systems.

Top officials at UC and CSU worry that passage of Proposition 92 on Feb. 5 could mean leaner times by shrinking the pool of discretionary money available from Sacramento for higher education.

CSU Chancellor Charles Reed has already come out against the measure and is recommending that the Board of Trustees vote to oppose it Tuesday in Long Beach. The UC Board of Regents, meeting in Los Angeles, will be asked on Thursday to either oppose it or remain neutral.

If approved by a majority vote, the ballot measure would create a new way of calculating state funding for the state's 72 community college districts. Currently, one formula sets funding for both community colleges and public K-12 schools. Prop. 92 would create separate criteria for the community colleges.

"Over the last 10 to 15 years ... community colleges have been notoriously underfunded," said Prop. 92 campaign spokesman Andrew Acosta. "It is a way to make it a stronger commitment from the state that community college students won't be caught in the state budget battles."

The state legislative analyst's office found that over the next three years taxpayers would end up spending about $300 million a year more than they do now on K-12 schools and community colleges. The legislative analyst's report estimates that about half of the new money would go to the K-12 schools for the first two years and the bulk would go to the community colleges in the third year. It's not clear what would happen after that.

"The proposition would spend an additional $300 million per year (roughly), but provides no new source of revenue," said Steve Boillard, director of higher education for the state legislative analyst. That means it would require using discretionary money in the state's general fund.
Enticing the public to vote for the proposition is a provision that would lower community college fees next fall for an estimated 2.5 million students to $15 a unit from $20 a unit. That would mean that fees for a full-time student would drop to $450 a year from $600 a year.

It also also limit future fee increases to whichever is lower: 10 percent or the change in the state's per capita personal income, which averages about 4 percent.

"They have written this initiative in a way that every constituency in the community college is on board," said CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor Karen Zamarripa.

She noted that low-income community college students already get a fee waiver and that passage of the proposition could mean higher fees for CSU and UC students who have been forced to pay more in recent years as the state reduced its proportional share of university funding.

Zamarripa will present her recommendation Tuesday to the members of the CSU Board of Trustees, urging that they oppose the proposition. She said Prop. 92 would leave CSU, UC and the departments of corrections and health and human services as the only areas of the budget where the state can make reductions.

"I don't think that we have a choice," she said of her recommendation. "The proposal is not because we don't think the community colleges need additional resources, I think they probably do. But so do the CSU and UC, which are all dependent on the general fund. This is just going to make matters more difficult than they already are."

UC President Robert Dynes is recommending to the regents that they choose from three options: take a neutral position, express their concerns or oppose the proposition. He is not recommending that they endorse it.

Sponsored by a group that includes the Community College League and the California Federation of Teachers, the proposition would also establish the community colleges in the state Constitution and increase the size of the system's governing board to 19 voting members from 16 voting and one nonvoting members.
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HACU and Latino Community Again Disappointed by the Governor’s Veto of the California Dream Act
AB 540 Students’ Dream of a College Education Dashed

SACRAMENTO, CA - The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) expressed
profound disappointment at Governor Schwarzenegger’s last-minute veto of Senator Cedillo’s California
Dream Act (SB 1). SB 1 would have allowed AB 540 students the opportunity to compete for financial
aid programs as permitted by federal law, including access to Board of Governor waivers at the
community colleges but excluding the competitive Cal Grants. This year’s bill was amended to address
issues raised in Governor Schwarzenegger’s veto message last year. This bill would have had no budget
impact and no U.S. Citizen or permanent resident would have been displaced by the passage of this bill.

“Senator Cedillo took steps to address the Governor’s concerns by limiting the number of grants for
which AB 540 students could compete. We are disappointed that the Governor chose not to display
leadership in the immigration debate by providing these hard-working students with the possibility of
making college a reality,” said Antonio Flores, President and CEO of HACU.

“HACU will continue to advocate for the DREAM Act at both the federal and state levels during future
legislative sessions. HACU expects that Congress and Governor Schwarzenegger will do the right thing
by talented youth who are college bound,” added Dr. Flores.

Currently, HACU has over 98 member colleges and universities in the state of California and in 2005
opened a regional office in Sacramento to handle Hispanic higher education legislative and policy issues
in the western region of the U.S.

HACU represents more than 450 colleges and universities committed to Hispanic higher education
success in the U.S., Puerto Rico, Latin America, Portugal and Spain. Although its member institutions in
the U.S. represent less than 10% of all higher education institutions nationwide, together they are home
to more than two-thirds of all Hispanic college students. HACU is the only national educational
association that represents Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs).
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