

SenateRostrum

- 2 President's Message
- 4 IMPAC
- 5 Community College Transfers
Succeed at UC
Diversity Award
- 6 The Call to Service
- 7 Academic Senate Website Grows
- 11 Faculty Leadership Institute



The Newsletter of the Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges

Students Pay When Colleges are Underfunded

• By Linda Collins, President

Any way you cut it, the community colleges are under-funded. We are some \$2300 to \$2500 below the national average in per-student funding. While our funding levels began to increase somewhat as California pulled out of the recession beginning in 1996, given the 16% increase in the number of students we're serving (from 1,336,000 in fall of 1995 to 1,548,250 in fall of 1999), the rate of funding per FTES actually declined from \$4279 in 1997-98 to \$4202 in 1999-00 (Nussbaum, March 2000). A recent analysis by the Chancellor's Office suggests that had the community colleges gotten their full 11% share of the mandated Proposition 98 funding, we would have received another \$2.3 billion.

How have we managed? In part, by deferring physical maintenance, underinvesting in instructional equipment and materials, foregoing faculty professional development and providing reduced student services. In part, we've managed by having higher class sizes; the California community colleges average a student-to-faculty ratio of 30:1 compared to the national average of 20:1. We've carried teaching loads 25% heavier than the national average. It

is also clear that community colleges have relied heavily on part-time faculty to balance the books.

Some districts have made cumulative investments over many years in a full-time tenured core of faculty, while others have not. The ratio of full- to part-time faculty as a percent of credit instruction varies enormously from district to district in California community colleges. The ratio ranges from a high of 83.1% (Siskiyou Joint) to a low of 39.5% (Yuba) (Chancellor's Office Report, Fall 1999; California Federation of Teachers document). The system-wide average has hovered in the low 60s, though some improvement has occurred in the last two years as the state has emerged from the recession and overall budgets have begun to increase. The Chancellor's Office reports that the percent of instruction taught by full-time faculty rose to 63.4% in fall 1999. This however is still more than 11 percentage points away from the system goal of 75%, established by AB1725 over a decade ago.

But what does this litany mean? Ultimately it means that community college students have paid the price for the consistent un-

See "Underfunded" on Page 8

Teaching as Loving: The Academy as Counterculture

• By Hoke Simpson, Vice President

"We do not support any budget proposal for part-time equity. We consider this to be a competitive market situation."

"If part-time instructors don't like the pay, they can go someplace else. After all, we're not running a slave economy here."

These remarks were made recently at Consultation Council and Board of Governors meetings, respectively. What they illuminate is more than a cavalier attitude toward the exploitation of California's thirty-two thousand part-time community college instructors; they also reflect attitudes towards academia, which go a long way toward explaining many of the issues and movements that have plagued the California Community College System—from both without and within—over the past decade.

Both comments construe employment at our colleges in terms of a "free market economy," and sug-

See "Teaching" on Page 10



Toward a More Perfect Union

If you're out there with too few resources and too many students, with too little and too old equipment, take heart. Help could be on the way.

This budget season is unlike any we've known. The state budget surplus is at an all time high, and seems to keep growing. Recent estimates place the figure at as much as \$10 billion. And education is the top priority not only of the Governor but also of the Legislature. At a retreat earlier this year, the Assembly Democrats indicated that community colleges are a top priority. The incoming speaker of the Assembly, Robert Hertzberg, has said community colleges are on the top of his list. The budget committees have begun meeting and are clearly signaling interest in funding community colleges. While the Governor's initial budget figures for the community colleges were disappointing, it's clear that the Governor and his staff are now interested and listening.

So, how will this play out? While none of us knows for sure, our best chance rests on being united as a system. That's why the recent agreement among faculty groups, administrators and the Chancellor on a budget packet is so important. For the first time all in the system have agreed that addressing human resources should be a priority. While it would seem obvious that hiring needs, particularly for faculty, would be a "no brainer," coming out of a long recession into a period of relative surplus, the system did not originally endorse this concept.

The agreement has three parts:

1. Adopting Board of Governors conditions to improve implementation and fiscal accountability for Partnership for Excellence (PFE) by ensuring that:

- districts use PFE funds for goals related to student success;
- expenditures follow appropriate collegial consultation and effective participation processes as

required by Title 5; and

- district governing boards review the PFE reports at a public meeting before sending them to Chancellor Nussbaum.

2. Creating an \$80 million human resources infrastructure fund to be distributed on an FTES basis to districts, with a small college minimum guarantee. The fund would be earmarked for compensation, benefits and office hours for part-time faculty to be bargained locally. The remainder would go to funding full-time faculty positions; meeting faculty and staff diversity goals; providing employee compensation and staffing; and enhancing and creating programs for staff development. The allocation of the funds will be determined locally, consistent with existing law, through collective bargaining and through collegial consultation and effective participation processes.

3. Revise Title 5 Regulations for the 75/25 full-time/part-time faculty ratio requiring districts to

See "Union" on next page



The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Linda Collins, President; **Hoke Simpson**, Vice-President

Ellen Ligons, Secretary; **Dennis Smith**, Treasurer; **Bill Scroggins**, Past President

Publications Committee:

Mark Snowwhite, Chair, Crafton Hills College

Elton Hall, Moorpark College

Gary Morgan, Oxnard College

Carolyn Seefer, Diablo Valley College

Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College

Editor: Julie Adams, Executive Director, Academic Senate

The Rostrum is a publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 910 "K" Street, Ste. 300, Sacramento, CA 95814. The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing.

Letters and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited. For deadline information, call (916) 445-4753, or email us at asccc@ix.netcom.com. The Rostrum is available on the Senate's Website at: <http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us>

“Union” from previous page

develop a five-year plan, updated annually, for making reasonable progress toward the goal. Progress toward this goal would be made in years where ongoing, unrestricted funds are provided beyond fully-funded cost of living adjustments and growth. Local plans would be developed following appropriate collegial consultation and effective participation processes as required by Title 5.

Particularly important to the success in reaching this agreement has been the continued unity among the faculty organizations across the state. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges worked closely with the Community College Association of the California Teachers Association (CCA/CTA), as well as the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers (CCC/CFT), the California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA), the California Community College Independents (CCCI), and the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC). All contributed to the collective dynamic and effort that pushed the discussion of the budget priorities toward meeting faculty and student needs.

The Academic Senate survey on the uses of the PFE funds created systemwide discussion on the issue of fiscal accountability and student success in the implementation of that program. While clearly many colleges have been doing exciting and essential work to improve student success, many others were not using the funds to address this legislative intent. The California Student Association of Community Colleges (CalSACC) was also active in bringing attention to their concerns about the lack of office hours available to stu-

dents who take classes with part-time faculty. Their concern about the use of PFE and the involvement of students in local discussions about student success also was critical to the effort.

The work of Assembly Member Scott Wildman in carrying and ultimately passing AB 420 to address part-time faculty benefits and office hours brought hiring and compensation issues to a head. The willingness of the Governor to sign the bill and to order a study of wages and working conditions among part-time faculty was critical. Hearings in the Legislature on issues of part-time employment focused attention on the unmet personnel needs in our system, and further galvanized part-time faculty, who have been organizing, to demand more equity in their pay and professional working conditions. Numerous rallies and writing campaigns highlighted the issues. Assembly Member Sarah Reyes, chair of the Assembly Budget Subcommittee dealing with higher education, forcefully admonished all to come to agreement and speak to the Legislature in one voice.

Ultimately, we should all take heart in the willingness of the Chancellor and the administrative groups to sit down with faculty and students to hammer out a budget that addresses the collective needs of the system. The resultant \$80 million budget proposal for human resource needs appears very likely to garner legislative support. Similarly, this unprecedented unity positions us well to advocate for the entire packet of budget priorities which includes: Partnership for Excellence, human resources, equalization, noncredit funding, technology, student outreach and access, faculty and staff diversity funds, scheduled main-

tenance and workforce equipment, as well as full COLA and growth.

The Board of Governors, too, deserve credit for urging us all toward compromise, and for recognizing and validating the work on the budget at their March meeting.

And hopefully, this new found agreement will become a foundation upon which we can all build an ongoing relationship of mutual respect and advocacy as we go about teaching and counseling and serving students.

If we are to capture these funds for our system, we all need to advocate for our colleges and for the system. There are many competitors for these dollars. I urge you to be active in articulating both the needs and the virtues of your colleges to your local legislators and newspapers. Remember, it's for the students. And please, advocate for the entire package. It's all of a piece. (For a copy of the complete package, see page 7.)



Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC)

• *By IMPAC Steering Committee Representatives*

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), representing the faculty of the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges, has been working over the past year on a very important project on articulation and transfer. Based on faculty-to-faculty dialogues across the state, the project will address issues related to lower division, pre-transfer major preparation. Conceived of as an ongoing project that will systematically address clusters of disciplines on a five-year cycle, the project has first begun to address the sciences. The first cluster addresses majors in biology, chemistry, mathematics and physics. Appropriate discipline faculty on your campus have recently been invited to attend regional meetings for the IMPAC project.

The Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) is a collaborative effort of ICAS and has two objectives:

- 1) the creation of a common understanding of and communication about the major preparation, including key components of the lower division curriculum; and

- 2) the establishment of a system of state and regional intersegmental faculty dialogues, by discipline and among related disciplines, to address curriculum issues related to articulation and transfer.

Through IMPAC, ICAS seeks to achieve the general objectives of increasing intersegmental collaboration, strengthening the alignment

of curriculum and the rigor of its delivery, building trust among faculty of the three segments, and serving students whose education is a shared mission of both the sending and receiving institutions. Important goals of IMPAC are to ensure that students are able to avoid unnecessary course work prior to transfer, ensure that all required courses are taken before transfer, and ensure that students do not have to repeat after transfer courses taken at the community college in preparation for the major.

The regional meetings are opportunities to bring faculty together in the disciplines to discuss the major preparation requirements at each of the UC and CSU campuses. Last April, a group of faculty members met in Los Angeles to come to an initial understanding about the courses needed for lower division major preparation in four disciplines: biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics at UC and CSU.

A statewide meeting will be held on May 12-13, 2000, at the Los Angeles Westin. At this meeting, regional representatives will be able to address the issues and concerns regarding Science Cluster I, discussed at the regional meetings. In addition, the second cluster will begin. The second Science Cluster is designed to address the following disciplines: Agriculture, Computer Science, Earth Sciences, Home Economics/Child Development, and Nursing. We encourage you to inform your faculty in the above discipline areas. If you

know faculty in these areas that would like to participate on the IMPAC project, please contact the Senate Office. You can also check out the IMPAC website at: <http://www.cal-impac.org>.

This is a faculty driven project funded by a state budget allocation administered through and based upon a proposal submitted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The Academic Senates of all three segments are united in working to ensure that IMPAC deliberations are based upon the expertise of appropriate faculty. We look forward to the many opportunities IMPAC will offer for the enhanced professional collaboration between faculty of the community colleges.

FORUM 2000

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is currently seeking submissions from faculty members for this year's issue of the Forum. This publication provides faculty with a means to express their creative sides to a receptive audience

Deadline for submission is May 3, 2000. Contact the Senate Office at (916) 445-4753 for details or log onto the Academic Senate website at www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us

Community College Transfers Succeed at UC

• *By Miki Mikolajczak, Counseling and Library Faculty Issues Committee Chair*

Efforts to increase the numbers of California community college students who transfer to University of California (UC) campuses may get a boost from recently released findings. A Summary of the Academic Performance of California Community College Students following Their Transfer to the University of California, by Steve Handell, presents a very positive picture of California community college students who transfer to UC in terms of persistence and graduation rates. This report includes the following points:

- *California community college students transferring to UC persist and . . . earn Bachelor's degrees at a higher rate than community college students nationally;*

- *Comparisons of transfer student performance versus [that of] UC native students using a standard cohort analysis reveal a high degree of similarity in academic persistence as they move toward completion of the Bachelor's degree; and*

- *Graduation rates between transfer students and UC native students (when considered from native students' junior year) are also similar, although preliminary research indicates that the graduation rate of native students may be approximately 10 % higher than that of transfer students from community colleges.*

This report should quell fears among those at UC who believe that community college transfer students are less academically capable than UC native students.

In addition, this report may encourage a greater effort by UC campuses to beef up outreach programs at community colleges. Presently UC Admissions staff have been assigned to coordinate community college articulation and outreach in numbers much lower than those for high school outreach. And UC staff members have not received sufficient training to help community college students make informed decisions. Furthermore, less than a third of UC's Admissions budget is used to support community college student recruitment (Mekis, Report on Little Hoover Commission Hearing on Community Colleges, March 25, 1999).

Yet there is reason for the community college faculty and students to remain hopeful that rates of transfer from the community colleges to UC campuses will pick up. In the fall of 1997 Chancellor Tom Nussbaum and UC President Atkinson signed a document entitled *Enhancing Student Transfer: A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California Community Colleges and the University of California*. An MOU Implementation Committee, which includes faculty leaders from the community colleges as well as from UC, has been developing plans and implementing regional agreements to facilitate transfer from community colleges to UC campuses. It is this committee that sponsored the Handell report touting the success of community college students at UC campuses.



Diversity Award Becomes a Reality

• *By Edith Conn, Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee Chair*

This year the Academic Senate will initiate a new award: The Regina Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award. The Executive Committee named the award after the 1993-95 president of the Senate because of her commitment to Diversity. Regina has originated, advanced, and implemented many programs and policies that have significantly increased the ability of the California community colleges to serve the diverse population of the state, including student equity and affirmative action in faculty hiring.

The Foundation for California Community Colleges will provide enough funds for one recipient from each of the four geographical areas to receive a cash award of \$500. Those nominated by their local academic senates will be evaluated on the basis of their contributions to diversity for both students and faculty.

Gus Guichard, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, said he was delighted that the Senate is presenting such awards because they promote goals of the Action Plan developed by the Chancellor's Office to implement the Board of Governors Commitment to Diversity.

Watch for applications this August.



The Call to Service

• By Linda Collins, President and Hoke Simpson, Vice President

On July 15, Governor Davis issued the following statement: "I strongly support community service and believe that a service ethic should be taught and re-enforced as a lasting value in California . . . I want our students to understand, as generations before them did, the importance of contributing to their communities . . ." He called on the three public systems of higher education to work toward the development of a community service requirement for undergraduate students. The Governor requested, through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, that a proposal be developed to implement a community service graduation requirement at all three segments of higher education in California.

At the Fall 1999 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges responded to Governor Davis' call for service by passing a resolution which affirmed that the faculty is committed to the "cultivation of altruism in service to society in general" (community service) and "committed to support and extend sound programs and offerings that promote a service ethic among students" (service learning). The resolution affirmed that we favor "*voluntary*" efforts rather than a system-wide community college graduation requirement for community service."

The Academic Senates of both UC and CSU came to similar conclusions. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates has since recommended that community service projects be a key funding area for the Intersegmental Joint Faculty Projects (IJFP), grants which encourage intersegmental faculty cooperation and coordination.

Within our system, there is much on which to build. Service learning programs and courses and volunteer centers are widespread in community colleges. Now we have an opportunity to extend these efforts and do some really exciting and important work.

The Executive Committee has been working towards implementation of our own resolution and has focused on three essential elements: 1) the development of service learning programs, in which elements of community service are incorporated into the curriculum, and for which students receive academic credit; 2) the development of campus community service volunteer centers, through which students perform volunteer service in the community, unrelated to course work and without academic credit; and 3) an emphasis on addressing real community needs, with the campus itself treated as a microcosm of the larger community.

In adapting the call to service to our community colleges, we need to speak to the unique and varied needs of our students. We believe that efforts toward service in our system should concentrate on providing real solutions to real needs—of our students and of the communities we serve. These needs are many, but we can focus on those that fall within the realm of the environment, public safety, human needs and education. Further, we can focus first on our own campus communities. After all, the California community colleges serve thousands of economically disadvantaged students who need help—and who need to learn to help themselves. These students often confront the same problems that exist in the larger community: hunger, inade-

quate transportation, inadequate health care, and insufficient child care. If we make our campuses a primary focus of service, we can help students make a difference in their own lives and in those of their fellow students.

A "campus first" approach to service will encourage students to analyze social issues, to discover that social problems can be resolved, and to enjoy the benefits of working in community with others. By starting with the needs they bring with them from their own communities, disadvantaged students in particular can learn to be proactive in removing barriers to their education. They can learn that their problems are not intractable, and that working in community can improve the community. To the extent efforts to address and resolve problems of our own students are successful, we predict students will experience higher retention rates, higher course completion rates, and higher success rates in all areas...but most importantly, we will take a giant step toward fulfilling the promise that we are the gateway to academic and economic success for *all* students.

The Academic Senate is currently working with the Chancellor's Office to develop these ideas into concrete proposals to implement service learning and community service efforts across the colleges. If you're interested in hearing more and helping to develop ideas and plans, attend the community service breakout at our upcoming 2000 Spring Plenary Session on Thursday, April 13, 2:00-3:30 p.m., San Francisco Airport Westin. (*With thanks to Ed Connolly, Brad Duncan, and Executive Vice Chancellor Patrick Lenz for their work and support of the Academic Senate on these issues.*)



Academic Senate Website Grows

• By Mark Snowwhite,
Publications Committee Chair

The Academic Senate's website continues to grow as an unequalled source of valuable information. Visitors will find notices of and registration forms for upcoming Academic Senate events, including pre-session area meetings and the increasingly popular summer institutes (leadership, curriculum, technology, and student leadership). The site also features position papers—both adopted and in draft form—and resolutions passed by the body. In addition, there will soon be a list of papers of interest to faculty by groups outside the Senate which are now available through the Senate Office. Another invaluable source of information is the list of links to other key sites, such as web pages of faculty organizations, the Chancellor's Office, the Accrediting Commission, the Community College League of California, professional organizations, and local senates.

And there is more to come. Planned for the future is a page for websites of interest to faculty on a number of pedagogical topics, which Carolyn Seefer (Publications Committee) will develop. Similarly, the Senate Office is working on an all new, easy-to-read format for the site.

Clearly, anyone interested in faculty issues, especially leaders of local senates, should check this site regularly. The web address is <http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us>.

Bookmark it now.



See "Union" on page 3

| Ongoing Local Assistance | Governor's January Budget | System Request | Difference (Augmentation Requested) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| COLA | \$103,080,000 | 111,892,000 | 8,812,000 |
| Growth | \$105,715,000 (3%) | 114,475,000 (4%) | 38,760 |
| Partnership for Excellence | \$25,000,000 | 155,000,000 | 130,000,000 |
| Human Resources Infrastructure | Not Proposed | 80,000,000 | 80,000,000 |
| Student Access and Outreach | \$12,100,000 | 27,909,000 | 15,809,000 |
| Credit Equalization | Not Proposed | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Noncredit Enhancements | Not Proposed | 12,800,000 | 12,800,000 |
| Telecommunications and Technology | \$6,300,000 | 16,300,000 | 10,000,000 |
| Economic Development | Not Proposed | 9,924,000 | 9,924,000 |
| Faculty and Staff Diversity | Not Proposed | 18,700,000 | 18,700,000 |
| Scheduled Maintenance | \$10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 0 |
| Workforce Equipment | \$5,000,000 | | |
| Total | \$267,195,000 | 602,000,200 | 339,805,200 |
| One-time Local Assistance | | | |
| Instructional Equipment/Scheduled Maintenance | | 65,000,000 | 65,000,000 |
| Federal Reporting | | 3,520,000 | 3,520,000 |
| Workforce Equipment | | 45,000,000 | 45,000,000 |

“Underfunded” from Page 1

derfunding of public higher education. It’s time to reverse this trend.

Vincent Tinto has argued that beyond the demographic variables associated with student success, the most powerful predictor of student retention is contact and interaction with faculty members. When students interact with their teachers—informally in the halls, in student club meetings, in labs or offices on campus, during office hours both scheduled and impromptu, at plays and musical performances, and at community events—faculty and students interact and gain a sense of each another beyond the classroom. We know that the more involved students are on campus, as tutors or student representatives or in any organized groups or events, the more likely they are to persist toward their goals, and to make it to their next stage of achievement. While part-time faculty may wish to participate in these myriad ways with our students, they generally are limited in their ability to do so.

As Norton Grubb points out, over-reliance on part-time faculty undermines collegiality and increases the sense of institutional fragmentation. Full-time faculty bear the essential responsibilities for general institutional maintenance (Honored But Invisible, 330-336). In some colleges there simply are not enough full-time faculty to do this work. Peer evaluation, program review, preparation of accreditation, governance, faculty hiring and curriculum development and renewal—all are necessarily borne by full-time, tenured faculty. If we consider the higher class sizes and the higher

teaching load, and couple that with the increasing institutional burden created by over-reliance on part-time faculty, we can see that educational integrity is threatened. Ultimately, our ability to attract and retain high quality teachers will also be eroded.

This is particularly troublesome given the nature of our student body. Many of our students, given the demands of family and work life, by necessity attend college part time. It is difficult for them to sustain connection to the college community. Increasing numbers of our students appear as well to be moving from one institution to another, taking a course here, another there. And part-time students drifting from part-time instructor to part-time instructor, or as Grubb notes, from institution to institution, in the long run stymies efforts to create coherent educational experiences. While the push to standardize curriculum and requirements at the state level is ostensibly pursued to help students in their transition from one institution to another, it should be noted that such efforts can undermine the efforts of any one college to create integrated contexts in which students can learn (Grubb, 352). Grubb points out that tendencies toward fragmentation are exacerbated by state policies such as common course numbering systems and standardized course descriptions. While he notes that many of these “disintegrative and centrifugal forces are outside the control of the community colleges,” he suggests that institutional practices which support good teaching and effective educational programs can help (352-355).

The notion that adequate undergraduate education and

student preparation can be accomplished simply by having students select courses in a cafeteria approach—a course from column a, another from column b—belies the growing understanding that what students need, and what keeps them on track in pursuing their educational objectives, is connection. In the courses and programs they take, students need to make connections among the varied disciplines and projects, requirements and assignments, academic and applied knowledge. Ultimately, whatever the objective or major, education is about connection—to the historical dramas of humanity across varied disciplines and cultures, connection to the cumulative set of skills and techniques in both the material and intellectual worlds, connections ultimately to oneself and one’s place in the world. Well-designed educational experiences heighten the opportunities for students to make such connections.

But the trend toward hiring increasing numbers of part-time faculty is generally not matched by institutional commitment or programs to link the part-time instructors to the college community or curriculum. Part-timers all too often are hired to teach disconnected courses without knowledge of the place of the course in the overall curriculum. If faculty don’t know how courses are related to one another, how can we expect our students to know? As Grubb points out, the idea that “teachers can be seen as interchangeable parts in a large ‘firm’ producing courses, or that English 10 and Business 101 can be taught by anyone with appropriate credentials,”

See “Underfunded” on next page

“Underfunded” from previous page assumes that “educational programs can be subdivided in this way, and that continuity among classes and collaboration among faculty are unimportant” (336).

Similarly, education requires human connection. Students need connection to one another in the learning process, connection to their teachers in both the formal and informal interactions of class and office hours, connections with counseling faculty who have time to address their short and long term needs, connections with skilled faculty in libraries where students learn and practice the tools of exploration, connections to caring and concerned staff in offices and laboratories where students matriculate and log in hours of practice. These connections are vital if students are to persist and to succeed. Again, over-reliance upon part-time faculty undermines such connections. While many part-time faculty struggle to hold unofficial and unpaid office hours, students cannot count on connection with part-time faculty outside of class. And overburdened, full-time faculty, teaching heavy loads while struggling to meet administrative deadlines and requirements necessary to sustain their departments and programs, will necessarily give shorter shrift to non-required interactions with students. It should be noted that the multiple demands of program maintenance and instruction tend to fall more heavily on occupational faculty, who simultaneously must market their programs, recruit and place students, solicit equipment donations and defend their often higher-cost programs.

There are other, and more

ominous, trends to consider. Institutions of higher education rely on the traditional protections that tenure and due process provides for academic integrity and freedom—for faculty and ultimately for their students. The ability to be honest, and to engage in full exploration of ideas and opinions in classrooms as well as in deliberative policy discussions, is enhanced by the institution of tenure. Part-time faculty do not share in those protections. According to the *Chronicle for Higher Education*, national reports indicate that part-time faculty are “getting dumped for things tenure-track faculty do with impunity—teaching controversial material, fighting grade changes, organizing unions” (Schnieder, “To Many Adjunct Professors, Academic Freedom Is A Myth,” 12/10/99). And notes Schneider, “the lack of protection makes academic-freedom violations of adjuncts almost impossible to track.”

This vulnerability of part-time faculty may be one of the reasons for the findings of Moore and Trahan regarding the relationship of tenure status to grading practices. In comparing grades of 417 introductory level college courses taught by all ranks of faculty, they found that the grade point average for courses taught by lower status instructors is substantially higher than that of higher status instructors (*Sociological Perspectives*, 1998 special issue). The authors speculate that adjunct faculty are by necessity much more vulnerable both to student grade complaints and negative student teaching evaluations. Hiring and retention of part-time faculty are often highly dependent on student evaluations, which in turn

are highly sensitive to grading practices. This suggests that part-time faculty are routinely placed in situations that pit institutional pressure against their best professional judgment. The recent surge of concern about accountability and outcomes promises to exacerbate such pressures.

If community colleges are to succeed, state policy makers and system leaders will need to recognize the systemic ills caused by chronic under-funding. Ultimately, creating effective teaching communities as well as communities of learners will require targeted investments of both resources and spirit. To engage our students effectively and link them to us, to convince them to stay when so much pulls them away, requires dedication and skill. To summon on an ongoing basis the energy needed—to revitalize programs, to communicate an infectious spirit of inquiry and learning, to sustain ongoing laboratories of curiosity and achievement—cannot be done by tired faculty who believe that their institutions are fundamentally hostile to them. We must find ways to create healthy regard for the work of faculty and for the work of the staff who labor alongside. Without a climate of respect, all the resources in the world can’t create healthy educational environments. But without sufficient resources, over time, our educational energy and spirit is sapped.

If, as Thomas Merton says, the purpose of education is to show students how to define themselves “authentically and spontaneously in relation” to the world, then as hooks suggests, faculty must themselves be con-

See “Underfunded” on Page 12

“Teaching” from Page 1

gest that instructors’ primary motive for seeking employment is pecuniary gain in the form of salary compensation. They are wrong on both counts.

Let us look first at the second claim and the matter of motive. Everyone knows that if you want to get a teacher’s goat, you simply point out that “Those who can do, and those who can’t teach.” Behind this jibe is a serious puzzle: For many outside our profession, who are fully integrated into the competitive market culture and who thus accept its values uncritically, the choice to become a teacher is truly baffling. Why would anyone with an education and a skill set that might earn them two to ten times as much in the marketplace, go into a profession with such narrow financial horizons?

Community college teachers need to reflect on the answer to this puzzle. For in that answer lies the definition of our status within the larger culture, the challenge that we currently face, and the value that is the underpinning of our enterprise.

The answer is both extraordinarily simple and extremely complex. The answer is simple because it can be stated in one word: *love*. And that word, of course, is what makes the answer so complex.

Let us first get over our embarrassment at the mention of the word “love” in connection with something so serious as our choice of a career. The source of that embarrassment is the portrayal of love in popular culture, an arena where, as social critic, bell hooks, points out, there is little space for the serious consideration of love. “In progressive political circles,” hooks writes, “to speak of love is to guarantee that one will be dis-

missed or considered naïve.” Popularly, love is seen in terms of gooey sentimentality, or extremes of sexual passion, both of which are considered mindless and irrational. Alternatively, as in Tina Turner’s song, “What’s Love Got to Do with It?”, love is portrayed as irrelevant, a “secondhand emotion.”

In searching for a definition of love that could serve as the basis for a discussion of love’s “transformative power” in overcoming oppression and exploitation, hooks settles on one offered by M. Scott Peck. In his self-help book, *The Road Less Traveled*, Peck defines love as “the will to extend one’s self for the purpose of nurturing one’s own or another’s spiritual growth.”

This definition resonates with the views of the philosopher Martin Heidegger. For Heidegger, authenticity, or what in this context we could call “self-love,” is the actualization of one’s “ownmost potentiality-for-Being-one’s-Self.” And authentic “Being-with-others”—that is, loving them—involves recognizing and facilitating the other’s capacity for self-actualization. For Heidegger, Being is a verb, and authentic Being is the product of choice. It is not just a state that befalls us. So, too, hooks asserts that love is best understood, not as a noun, but as a verb, an activity, and she quotes Peck as saying, “Love is as love does. Love is an act of will—namely both an intention and an action. Will also implies choice. We do not have to love. We choose to love.”

It is in this sense that love can be understood as the motive for entering the profession of teaching. In contrast to the prevailing misconception of teaching as “information delivery,” teaching is in fact the nurturing of other human beings, the facilitation of others in

their effort to become more fully themselves. Teaching is, in its essence, independent of discipline and specific informational content. Moreover, those who respond to teaching as a calling (as opposed to a job), have discovered that in nurturing others, one also nurtures one’s self. This is the remarkable “feedback loop” of love. Self-obsession never produces the desired result; it is only in going outside of, or “extending,” one’s self in caring for others that one achieves an increase in one’s own sense of completeness and well-being. We might reasonably modify Peck’s definition to read that love is “the will to extend one’s self for the purpose of nurturing one’s own spiritual growth through nurturing that of others.” One is reminded of the children’s story, *The Velveteen Rabbit*, in which a toy rabbit becomes real as the result of being loved by its little boy owner. The story is intended to instruct its readers, of course, not in the making of real rabbits, but in how to become more real themselves.

Part-time instructors, who stay at it year after year, patching together a schedule among three or four colleges, flying the freeways, and applying for every full-time position that opens up, these instructors are not doing this because they are insufficiently talented to do anything else. They are doing it because they find fulfillment in teaching. Part-time instructors certainly don’t love the exploitative pay and the insecurity; like their full-time colleagues, however, they do love to teach.

Just as it is mistaken to assume that community college teachers’ primary motive for entering the profession is financial compensation, so, too, it is an error to

See “Teaching” on next page

“Teaching” from previous page
claim that employment in California’s community colleges is a “competitive market situation.” The fact is that college instructors are carefully insulated from the competitive market economy, and for good reason. The “insulators” are the institutions of academic freedom and tenure; the reason for the insulation is that seeking and teaching the truth is incompatible with the fear for one’s livelihood typical of employees-at-will.

In a recent column in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Michael Bérubé offers some tongue-in-cheek advice to colleges and universities on how they might more closely approximate the practices of big business. He writes,

...[T]enure prevents university presidents and trustees from engaging in what may be the hallmark of American business today: the use of efficiency experts and external consultants to fire middle-aged account executives, nurses, editors, and secretaries, after having made them run a humiliating gauntlet of pointless self-assessment trials....

Like business, academe is rife with anxiety, territorialism, and ill will. But what academe lacks is a mature culture of abjection and groveling. Fifty-something faculty members with 30 or more years of service to their colleges simply do not live in terror that they may be terminated without reason. That constitutes a major reason why most Americans do not understand the institution of tenure.

That most Americans “do not understand” tenure is Bérubé’s understated way of saying that in fact they hate it. That faculty are privileged to live beyond the reach of the naked forces of the marketplace

can be a source of considerable resentment. That resentment seems to fuel many of the movements with which we have recently had to contend:

- the demand that colleges adopt modes of management in imitation of corporations;
- the requirement that colleges become an extension of the marketplace, supplying training-on-demand to local businesses;
- constant cries for increased accountability, denying the legitimacy of the traditional accreditation system, and insisting on measurable goals;
- the increasing use of part-time instructors;
- the call for rollover contracts for full-time instructors;
- the demearing of teaching and the expertise of teachers, manifested in such forms as:

(a) an insistence on a pseudo-egalitarianism (“We’re a *learning* institution, in which teachers and students are all learners.” “The teacher shouldn’t be a sage on the stage, but a guide on the side.”); and

(b) the uninhibited embracing of technology: the suggestion that instruction is simply information delivery and learning is the acquisition of competencies, a process which does not really require a live teacher, and which in fact is probably carried out more efficiently—and certainly more conveniently—through Web-based, multimedia instructional modules;

- the application of evaluative processes borrowed from industry, such as Total Quality Management, where the word “quality” is newspeak for “quantity,” and where the criteria are productivity, efficiency, and flexibility to meet changing marketplace demands;
- the call for performance-based financial incentives for both

institutions and faculty; and

- the demand for an end to the institution of tenure.

As mentioned earlier, these movements have found voices from both without and within, coming not only from the public, but with equal and often greater vehemence from administrators, who themselves do not share the same protections as the faculty.

What emerges here is a picture of the academy as a counterculture, one whose value system stands in stark opposition to that of the “competitive marketplace.” The ethic of the academy is what bell hooks calls a “love ethic,” or an ethic of service. The revolutionary potential of this ethic can be measured by the vehemence with which the champions of the “marketplace” attempt to impose their own values upon it, and to snuff out the institutions, like academic freedom and tenure, that support it.

Will the California community colleges succumb and become extensions of the marketplace? If the state System and many of our local administrators have their way, yes. If faculty and students are clear about the nature and the worth of their enterprise, no.

Meanwhile we need to resist the economic exploitation of part-time instructors, recognizing that the justification for that exploitation (that it’s a “competitive market situation”) involves a denial of the protections that create the space required for intellectual honesty and freedom in teaching and research. Academic quality and integrity demand that these protections be extended to part-time instructors. Moreover, exploitation is simply wrong, morally, and if the culture of the marketplace con-

See “Teaching” on Page 12

"Underfunded" from Page 9

nected, impassioned and engaged (hooks, *Teaching to Transgress*, 199). While material conditions will not guarantee that spark, without sufficient support, the spark cannot be sustained. Taking heart requires both. And the time is now.

NOTE: The Joint Legislative Audit Committee held an investigative hearing into the use of part-time faculty in the community colleges. Part-time faculty from a range of organizations and colleges testified, including FACCC, CCA/CTA, CCC/CFT. The Academic Senate was asked to speak to the educational implications and impact of the reliance on part-time faculty, and the professional status of part-time faculty. Representatives of the Chancellor's Office, as well as CPEC, and CEOs selected by CCLC also provided testimony. The hearing, conducted by Assembly Member Scott Wildman, Joint Committee Chair, clearly signaled interest in the Legislature over the working conditions of part-time faculty as well as growing use of part-timers, in spite of the standard set in AB1725 over a decade ago that 75% of all credit instruction should be taught by full-time faculty. If you are interested in purchasing the tape of the hearing, you can contact your legislator.



MARK YOUR CALENDARS

June 4 - 10, 2000
*2000 Technology
Institute, CSU
Monterey Bay, Seaside,
California*

June 5 - 8, 2000
*2000 Student
Leadership Institute,
CSU Monterey Bay,
Seaside, California*

June 22 - 25, 2000
*Faculty Leadership
Institute, Granlibakken
Conference Center in
Lake Tahoe*

July 13 - 15, 2000
*Curriculum Institute,
Hyatt Hotel, San Jose
California*

*Information and
applications are now
available on the Senate
Website at [http://
www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us](http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us)*

"Teaching" from Page 11

done it, then that culture needs to change. From this perspective it would seem that the end most to be desired is that the marketplace should become an extension of the academy. This is indeed an old but enduring revolutionary vision, that the world should be driven by love and not the desire for material gain. Its seed is with us, and we should nurture it.

1 hooks, bell. *Outlaw Culture*, "Love As the Practice of Freedom." (New York: Routledge, 1994) p. 247.

2 Cited in hooks, *Ibid*.

Also cited in: hooks, bell. All About Love: New Visions. (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 2000) p. 4.

3 Jones, W. T. *A History of Western Philosophy, vol. V: The Twentieth Century to Wittgenstein and Sartre*. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975) pp. 309-317.

4 hooks. *Outlaw Culture*, p. 247. *All About Love*, pp. 4-5.

5 Williams, Margery. *The Velveteen Rabbit*. (New York: Henry Holt, 1999 reprint edition.)

6 Bérubé, Michael. "A Shakespeare Department and Other Business Ideas for Colleges Everywhere." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 28, 2000, p. A64.

7 hooks, in *Outlaw Culture*, p. 249, writes: "A love ethic emphasizes the importance of service to others....In part, we learn to love by giving service. This is again a dimension of what Peck means when he speaks of extending ourselves for another."

