On a recent release, singer-songwriter Lucinda Williams describes a mendacious lover’s speech: *Choking on your unplanned words/*

_Coughing up your lies/Tumbling from your mouth a flurry/Of broken butterflies._

This striking image of abused and damaged beauty seems peculiarly apt when discussing the promise of California’s public postsecondary education: In our public documents, we have coughed up the promise of equity; in reality, we have delivered broken butterflies. As in Ms. Williams’ song, the issue is whether—and how—the damage can be healed.

AB 1725 and the Master Plan expressed the lofty ideal that every citizen who could benefit from it would have access to a high quality postsecondary education. The Legislature then established (or continued) a funding pattern for the three public segments that systematically discriminates against those students who might be expected to attend community colleges—i.e., those from the lower socioeconomic stratum of society—and that systematically favors those from the higher strata, those who might be expected to attend the CSUs and the UCs. It is time that we call attention to this breaker of butterflies, this discriminatory funding pattern that gives the lie to the promise of equity. We must label discriminatory funding for what it is, and clearly identify it, not as a fiscal issue, but as moral one.

Currently the funding per full-time equivalent student (FTES) for each of the segments is:

- UC: $25,000
- CSU: $11,000
- CCC: $4,700

Had we all started out with equitable funding and simply drifted toward the current figures as a result of things like differentiation of function (UC trains graduate students, for example; we don’t) that would be one story. The Joint Committee of the Legislature responsible for the 1989 review of the Master Plan, _California Faces, California’s Future:_ _Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy_, didn’t think that story would be an accurate one. They explicitly pointed out that the funding inequities could not be ex-

---

For the Academic Senate, the late summer is a period of intensive planning. The first meeting of the academic year is held in mid-August, by which time members of the Executive Committee have been assigned the chair-ship of a major committee or task force, and is responsible for producing a "work plan" in the form of a set of goals and objectives for the coming year. Each chair bases his or her plan on the annual report from last year’s committee, on resolution assignments from plenary sessions (many resolutions are given to specific committees to carry out), and on discussions with the president about priorities for the year ahead. To see a list of this year’s chairs please visit our website.

For this first issue of the Rostrum of the new academic year, we have asked a sampling of committee chairs to give you the highlights of what their committees will be doing in the coming months.

Of course, as president, I too chair a committee, the Executive Committee, and it seemed to me that the Executive Committee, too, should have a strategic plan for the purpose of giving added focus to our work, and enabling us to see that—and how—we are all contributing to a common endeavor. Formulating the plan was also an occasion for me, as new president, to indicate my priorities for the year, and to seek consensus on, and development and expansion of those. That process has now been completed, so let me share some of the highlights with you. (The entire plan can be viewed on our website, http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us.)

In thinking of our goals, we tried to identify, in the most general terms, what we think the Academic Senate does. We came up with the following four:

I. Strengthen local senates;
II. Provide resources to local senates;
III. Create, maintain, and protect policy;
IV. Serve to quicken the conscience of the Community College System.

While number four seems a bit grandiose, and one and two seem to overlap, we felt that our meaning would be clear through the specification of objectives and action plans related to each goal.

Under the first, “Strengthen Local Senates,” I think the most exciting objective is to “tighten the bond between the Academic Senate and local senates,” which we intend to do by sending Executive Committee members to the field to visit local senate meetings. Because there are so many colleges, and so few Executive Committee members, their efforts will be augmented by members of the Relations with Local Senates Committee.

Under the goal, “Provide Resources to Local Senates,” falls the objective of completing and bringing forward for adoption the many papers we have in the works. Among these papers we have in the works. Among these this year are papers on Part-time Faculty Issues, Information Competency, Planning, and Budgeting, Faculty Ethics, and the Workforce Investment Act. Another objective under this goal is to increase the relevance and effectiveness of our many institutes, and to explore the feasibility of adding a Teaching Institute, as called for by Resolution 12.02 from the Spring 2001 Plenary Session.

Under “Create, Maintain, and Protect Policy,” a significant objective is to carry forward the important work on faculty development begun under Linda Collins. To this end, the Executive Committee will introduce a resolution at Fall Session calling for the development of a paper on best practices in light of Norton Grubb’s critique in Honored but Invisible: An Inside Look at...
Increasing Contact with the Local Senates:  

A New Charge for the Relations with Local Senates Committee and the Academic Senate Executive Committee  

by Kate Clark, Vice President

Our Board of Governors recognizes the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as the exclusive representative of the local academic senates in the state’s community colleges. To accomplish its charge, the Academic Senate is committed to strengthening connections with the field. Such connections enable the state senate to acquire the collective wisdom of the faculty, to point to exemplary activities, to speak with greater knowledge and hence authority. These communicative structures also facilitate the distribution of information to local senates who may then function more effectively and develop informed and sound positions or policies.

One such structure was the Local Academic Senates Network, also known as the Geoclusters, developed in 1992. Under the Local Senates Network, a member of the Relations with Local Senates Committee was designated as the leader of colleges clustered in a given geographical region. Geocluster leaders were to meet with the local senate presidents in their geocluster and bring issues and information back to the Relations with Local Senates Committee. The Committee would in turn translate those issues and ideas into recommendations for broader statewide resolutions, positions, workshops or technical assistance visits.

The geocluster structure was revised periodically, but it eventually proved to be less effective than originally envisioned. Subsequent resolutions adopted by the body noted the inherent geographical barriers in some of the networks and the varying implementation of the networks in the different regions. The growing use of electronic communications was also cited as a factor that made geoclusters less relevant.

The Local Senates Network of geoclusters was repealed in Spring 1999.

Subsequent to the development of the geoclusters, the Executive Committee continued to develop and extend efforts to expand communication and connections with the field. Recently the plenary session passed a resolution calling for the Executive Committee to devise a method of contact to fill the void that some perceived with repeal of the geoclusters as a primary means of contact with the field. Academic Senate President Hoke Simpson has set as a goal that each college’s academic senate faculty shall be visited by a member of the Executive Committee or of its Relations with Local Senates Committee during the 2001-2002 academic year. Executive Committee members agree to visit several colleges within their geographic area, though not within their own district. The purpose of these campus visits would be to bring greetings as an official delegate of the Academic Senate, to listen, and to learn of the local senates’ work, challenges, and successes. To assist in this effort, members of the Relations with Local Senates Committee would be called upon by the President to visit those colleges not visited by Executive Committee members. This augmented contact will supplement, rather than supplant, other forms of contact with the Executive Committee. The visits will also assist local senates in identifying the need for other senate services, such as technical assistance.

The Relations with Local Senates Committee seems particularly suited to this challenge as its existing charge includes the responsibility to “publicize successful local senate activities in Senate publications, the
The Curriculum Committee

by Elton Hall, Curriculum Committee Chair

Since curriculum is the center around which faculty activities circle, the Curriculum Committee is at the heart of the Academic Senate’s work. As with all Academic Senate committees, resolutions approved by delegates in session are the engine that drives the work of the Curriculum Committee.

This academic year promises a number of challenges and opportunities for the Committee. The annual Curriculum Institute for 2001 was held in July at the Sheraton Universal Hotel, Universal City. It was an enormous success, challenging the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate to plan a high quality program for next summer. Since the last institute was held in the South, the 2002 Summer Curriculum Institute will be held in the North at the San Jose Hyatt on July 11 - 13, 2002. Visit our website for more information.

A new curriculum handbook, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, has been approved, and contains a number of welcome changes. Some forms have been shortened and others clarified, and now the local senate president must sign off on programs being submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for approval. The timeline for program approval by that office has been shortened by half from 120 to 60 days. The application process for program approval has been clarified and helpful examples provided.

Altogether, the handbook should be a significant improvement over past efforts, thanks in great part to the work of the Academic Senate. Look for a breakout on the curriculum handbook, which is titled Program and Course Approval Handbook, during fall session.

A fall session breakout will also review a new agreement on college credit for courses taken in high school. Under this agreement, local curriculum committees will have to develop processes for articulating high school and college courses. A breakout on this topic will also occur during fall session.

Information competency as a graduation requirement remains an ongoing discussion, and the Committee is reflecting on a best practices paper on the subject of information competency in response to a resolution approved last spring.

Despite changes in the new curriculum handbook, the Committee will continue its efforts to persuade the Chancellor’s Office to empower local curriculum committees to approve all stand alone courses. The Committee will examine the feasibility of establishing credit courses in leadership for student leaders. And, as always, the Committee is ready to provide technical assistance to local curriculum committees. For assistance, contact the Academic Senate Office at ascc@ix.netcom.com or (916)445-4753.
It’s that time again. As some of you may be aware, this fall begins the initial step in the formal review of the Disciplines List. The Disciplines List establishes the minimum qualifications for the faculty of California community colleges. The passage of AB 1725 delegated to the Academic Senate the responsibility of making recommendations to the Board of Governors for professional preparation for instructors in each discipline in the California Community College curriculum. Every three years the list is reviewed to permit faculty and discipline organizations to propose changes. The Standards and Practices Committee is responsible for coordinating this effort. The Disciplines List review began with a call to the field in September for suggested changes to the list. Discussion of these revisions will occur at Area Meetings this fall and during the 2001 Fall Plenary Session.

In fact, a breakout to debate suggested revisions will be held during the Fall Session. Following the Fall Plenary Session, the proposed list of changes will be sent to local senate presidents, CIOS, CEOs, Curriculum Committee Chairs, and disciplines organizations. A major component of the Disciplines List review happens at statewide hearings prior to 2002 Spring Plenary Session. Prior to submission to the Board of Governors, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approves the final versions of the disciplines list change resolutions before being debated at the Spring Plenary Session. The process of the Disciplines List review is a lengthy one that really highlights the cooperative efforts of many groups throughout the state.

While the Disciplines List review will consume most of the Committee’s time, the Standards and Practices Committee has already begun its work. The Committee has just completed the nomination process for the faculty seat of the Board of Governors. There are two faculty representatives who sit on the Board of Governors. Each serves a two-year term that ends on an alternating basis. The Standards and Practices Committee, in consultation with the President, conducts the initial review of applicants to serve and recommends up to five of these individuals to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. The Governor makes the faculty appointments from a list of three recommendations put forward by the Academic Senate. The Standards and Practices Committee is excited to be involved in this very important aspect of shared governance. This year the Executive Committee will forward the following three names to the Governor: Michael Anker, Diablo Valley College, Philosophy; Linda Collins, Los Medanos College, Sociology; and Janis Perry, Santa Ana College, Counseling. The three candidates are highly qualified to represent the faculty of the 108 California Community Colleges to the Board of Governors.

In addition to the above, the Committee will also be responsible for overseeing the awards processes for the Hayward Award, LaRoche Award, the Regina Stanback-Stroud Award and Exemplary Program Award. The Board of Governors sponsors the Hayward and Exemplary Program awards. The Hayward Award is given to one faculty member from each of the four areas in recognition of excellence in education. The Regina Stanback-Stroud Award is given to four faculty members from each of the four areas in recognition of faculty in California community colleges who work to promote the success of our diverse student population. The Exemplary Program Award is rewarded to one program in each of the four areas. It identifies successful community college programs that impact student success. The Jonnah LaRoche Memorial Scholarship provides two scholarships for two continuing students and one for a transfer student. The Standards and Practices Committee will also be reviewing proposed bylaws changes and continuing to develop strategies to increase compliance with regulations regarding fair and effective hiring practices and to enhance the role of local senates in faculty hiring processes. The Standards and Practices Committee looks forward to working with the many groups across the state that will help us fulfill our missions and those of the Academic Senate.
A Report from the Affirmative Action/Cultural Diversity Committee

by Dibakar Barua, AA/CD Committee Chair

During the last academic year, following extensive deliberations and research, the Affirmative Action/Cultural Diversity Committee completed a draft of an Affirmative Action Handbook, which was circulated and discussed during a breakout of the 2001 Spring Plenary Session in San Francisco. After much discussion and debate, the session voted to refer the draft back to the Executive Committee for revision and rewriting. Delegates liked the overall content of the Handbook, but many felt that some passages of the Handbook seemed too preachy and might alienate some readers, thus hampering rather than promoting the principle of equal opportunity hiring in community colleges. The Committee has now completed the revision. However, the Handbook may still not see the light of day.

On September 4th, the state Appellate Court ruled on Connerly v. State Personnel Board et al. Specifically, they ruled that the statutory scheme contained in Education Code §§87100 through 87107, codifying the community college provisions for affirmative action in faculty hiring, violate the principle of equal protection and Proposition 209. The AA/CD Committee and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate consider that the affirmative action regulations in the Education Code and Title 5 were wise, fair,
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Community College Teaching. We also hope to explore the relationship between faculty evaluations and a strong faculty development program.

Finally, under our rather turgid goal, “Serve to Quicken the Conscience of the Community College System,” we have identified the objective, to “seek equity for California community college students,” and with that, two very important action plans. The first is the development, under a grant from the Chancellor’s Office, of a Student Equity Handbook. You may know that Title 5 requires each college district to have a student equity plan on file with the Chancellor’s Office—yet there is no requirement that the plan be adhered to and, consequently, no oversight in this regard. The Academic Senate hopes to ameliorate this situation by providing solid guidelines to help colleges fulfill the promise that every student who comes to our doors will have the maximal opportunity to achieve his or her educational goals.

The second action plan is to “seek to assure equal educational opportunity for community college students by calling for a change in the current funding pattern for the three public higher education segments.” The current pattern, we maintain, systematically discriminates against community college students, and we would change the arena of discourse on this issue from the purely fiscal to the moral as well. The lead article in this copy of the Rostrum constitutes an opening salvo on this front.

At our Summer Leadership Institutes, we regularly emphasize to participants the importance of strategic planning for local senates. It is a critical strategy for achieving and maintaining one’s focus, it provides benchmarks for one’s success, and the collaborative development and publication of the plan keeps one accountable to one’s constituents. I hope you’re reassured to know that, at the statewide level, we’re practicing what we preach.
Transfer: A Political Issue or A College Mission?

In the past academic year, considerable attention of legislators, academics, and the larger community was devoted to the transfer mission of the California community colleges, one of two primary missions we have—though only one of six missions adopted by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Whether it was the infamous and generally reviled “low-transfer list” that awakened the general public; or the clamor of some students for common course numbering that they mistakenly believed would solve all their transfer dilemmas; or the legislative response in the ever-mutating AB 1603 Common Course Numbering bill; or the research on the success of IGETC (see below); or the implementation efforts on behalf of the Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) crafted by our Chancellor and the system heads of University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU); or the Dual Admissions Proposal (DAP) of the UC, or the continued efforts of discipline faculty to align expected competencies as defined through the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project; or the work of California Articulation Number System (CAN) or ASSIST or student friendly; or the “Transfer: The Next Generation” initiative of the California Education Roundtable, the word for the year seemed to be TRANSFER. Within the community colleges, we were told to increase articulation, get the numbers up, move those students on without, as one CSU administrator noted, “any unnecessary or noncredit academic work.” All of these matters have been discussed and debated in Academic Senate publications, during Area meetings, and at our fall and spring plenary sessions.

Pressured by our own institutional goals, and by college administrators as well as legislators who wished to see measurable performance and accountability, too often we faculty felt as if we were being asked to turn to our students and “Round ’em up, and head them out,” as if they were cattle. Yet we must acknowledge the heroic work conducted, both by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and its representatives to statewide efforts, and especially by the thousands of local community college discipline and counseling faculty who resisted that approach and chose to see our students as human beings with vital potential and their progress not as numeric items in bureaucratic reports but as genuine scholarly efforts that deserved thoughtful consideration beyond mere tallying of credits in the name of transfer. For faculty, transfer remained a shared and complex effort.

As we commence a new academic year, it behooves us, then, to look at the current status of some of the more visible transfer efforts of last year to place them within the larger context that this coming year portends.

CAN: The California Articulation Number System (CAN) received a much-needed boost as a result of three separate actions:

1. Our UC and CSU transfer partners extended the activities of CAN through their work in the IMPAC project, and by agreeing in the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates that the UC Council of Academic Senates would appoint faculty to sit on the CAN Board of Directors; in turn the CAN Board will reexamine its processes to address the concerns of UC faculty about the actual CANning of courses. These efforts seek to make UC a full partner in the work of CAN.

2. The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges declared CAN to be the official third numbering system and directed colleges and districts to implement this project fully on their campuses. This action is not inconsonant with previous Academic Senate resolutions and
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plained by differentiation of function. We can add substance to the Joint Committee’s claim if we trace the funding pattern back in time. If we go back to 1965-66, five years after the Master Plan was adopted, we find that UC was funded at $2937 per FTES, CSU at $1256, and the CCCs at $554. The pattern over the past 35 years is shown in the samples in the graph on the next page.

There is not much drift here. The CCCs have received an average of 49% of CSU’s per student apportionment and 21% of UC’s. This is evidence that the disparity in funding is determined, not by the differing functions of the three segments, but by assumptions about the nature of the students expected to attend each segment and a tacit commitment to maintaining historical distinctions of social and economic class.

The “tacit” in the last sentence is important. I am not saying that this commitment has been made consciously (at least not by all parties). I do not believe, for example, that legislators have sat down and concluded that it would be best if students from lower socio-economic strata would be better off staying where they are. Yet the historical evidence makes it clear that the commitment has been made. How then to explain it?

My surmise is that we might begin to explain this, as so much in American culture, by an appeal to the phenomenon of ambivalence. The conflicting impulses in this case are, on the one hand, a “democratic” impulse, which would see all people realize their full potential, and, on the other hand, an “elitist” impulse, which would maintain the status-quo, with its distinctions of economic and social class.

In terms of our images of ourselves, we have no problem recognizing the generous spirit of the democratic impulse, with its insight that each human being is a center of value deserving of full actualization. It is more difficult to acknowledge in ourselves the contrary, elitist spirit, which would preserve for each of us what we already have, and would discourage—or even punish—both in ourselves and others, aspirations to transcend the bounds of one’s inherited status. There is, however, compelling evidence that this tendency runs deep in all of us. It is perhaps seen most dramatically when we look at those who have the least, whose lot seems to be one primarily of pain and suffering, but who nonetheless cling to their condition as if it were a treasure. It is, for example, a psycho-sociological cliché that those who have been abused in childhood tend to seek out abusive relationships in adulthood-relationships in which they then remain, or, if they should escape them, then duplicate in the next relationship they enter. Such behavior speaks volumes of the human “stake in the familiar.” Human beings, it suggests, would rather suffer than to change. We seem to perceive that it is both easier and safer to remain with what we know than to deal with the unfamiliar.

Another factor involved, perhaps, in the acceptance of blatant discrimination in the pattern of our funding of education is an inclination to “blame the victim”—a form of social Darwinism—even when the victim is ourselves. If I have emerged from high school with something considerably less than academic distinction, there is much in my environment to tell me that the fault is my own. I had the same opportunities, it is argued, as my academically successful colleagues, I simply wasted them. If I have been successful in college, we already have, and would discourage—or even punish—both in ourselves and others, aspirations to transcend the bounds of one’s inherited status. There is, however, compelling evidence that this tendency runs deep in all of us. It is perhaps seen most dramatically when we look at those who have the least, whose lot seems to be one primarily of pain and suffering, but who nonetheless cling to their condition as if it were a treasure. It is, for example, a psycho-sociological cliché that those who have been abused in childhood tend to seek out abusive relationships in adulthood-relationships in which they then remain, or, if they should escape them, then duplicate in the next relationship they enter. Such behavior speaks volumes of the human “stake in the familiar.” Human beings, it suggests, would rather suffer than to change. We seem to perceive that it is both easier and safer to remain with what we know than to deal with the unfamiliar.

Yet the historical evidence makes it clear that the commitment has been made. How then to explain it?

My surmise is that we might begin to explain this, as so much in American culture, by an appeal to the phenomenon of ambivalence. The conflicting impulses in this case are, on the one hand, a “democratic” impulse, which would see all people realize their full potential, and, on the other hand, an “elitist” impulse, which would maintain the status-quo, with its distinctions of economic and social class.

In terms of our images of ourselves, we have no problem recognizing the generous spirit of the democratic impulse, with its insight that each human being is a center of value deserving of full actualization. It is more difficult to acknowledge in ourselves the contrary, elitist spirit, which would preserve for each of us what we already have, and would discourage—or even punish—both in ourselves and others, aspirations to transcend the bounds of one’s inherited status. There is, however, compelling evidence that this tendency runs deep in all of us. It is perhaps seen most dramatically when we look at those who have the least, whose lot seems to be one primarily of pain and suffering, but who nonetheless cling to their condition as if it were a treasure. It is, for example, a psycho-sociological cliché that those who have been abused in childhood tend to seek out abusive relationships in adulthood-relationships in which they then remain, or, if they should escape them, then duplicate in the next relationship they enter. Such behavior speaks volumes of the human “stake in the familiar.” Human beings, it suggests, would rather suffer than to change. We seem to perceive that it is both easier and safer to remain with what we know than to deal with the unfamiliar.

Another factor involved, perhaps, in the acceptance of blatant discrimination in the pattern of our funding of education is an inclination to “blame the victim”—a form of social Darwinism—even when the victim is ourselves. If I have emerged from high school with something considerably less than academic distinction, there is much in my environment to tell me that the fault is my own. I had the same opportunities, it is argued, as my academically successful colleagues, I simply wasted them. Never mind that the obstacles to my academic success may have been Herculean; this is easy to overlook in the analysis of my “failure.” The result can be that I and those around me accept as a given that any institution that will now give me another chance should be less than first-rate.

That this is a cliché is confirmed by the large number of psychology texts which assert this syndrome as fact without offering any support from research. Such support does exist, however. See, for example, T orr and Swisher, Violence Against Women, Greenhaven Press, 1999, San Diego, California; and Simons et al., “Explaining Women’s Double Jeopardy: Factors that Mediate the Association between Harsh Treatment as a Child and Violence by a Husband,” Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol. 55 (3), 1993, pp. 713-723. Thanks to Teresa Jacob of the Grossmont College Psychology Department for the research.
The first-rate institutions are seen to be the just deserts of the students who made the most of their opportunities the first time around. The institutions with the antiquated science labs, the outdated technology, the peeling paint and the failing air conditioning—with the years of remedial classes, inadequate resources for remediation, and inadequate counseling resources—with peers as tutors, no money for learning communities and interdisciplinary classes, and impoverished libraries—with faculty who teach too many students in too many classes, who have no resources for professional growth, and who, with their administrators, are perpetually having to make unacceptable choices about which features of a quality education to sacrifice in order to offer any education at all—these are the institutions that the “slackers” who didn’t make it the first time deserve.

There is also, by way of explaining the widespread acceptance of our discriminatory funding, simple ignorance of what is really going on. There are probably few legislators and fewer members of the general public who are aware of the per-student funding disparities in the higher education segments. And those who are aware are probably telling themselves that the community colleges are a bargain, because they do “the job” with so much less. And, yes, we are a bargain, because in fact we do a wonderful job with what we’ve got. But the plain fact is that you simply cannot offer the same level of educational opportunity to a student who is funded at $4,700 as you can to one who is funded at $25,000. To suppose otherwise is willful blindness.

We are doing a job, but not the job. The job of turning, not the top 12 1/2% (UC) nor the top 33 1/3% (CSU), but the top 100% of our applicants into potential UC and CSU graduates, into skilled workers with the capacity for lifelong learning and advancement in their fields, into reflective, competent, compassionate members of their communities with the will and the resources to participate effectively and constructively in democratic processes, is going to take a lot more money than we have ever gotten. For so many of our students, it is a miracle that they have come to us at all. And then, too often, that miracle is wasted because we lack the resources to keep them and get them to their goals. This is the perpetual tragedy behind the pattern of disparate funding of higher education in California.

Finally, we have to face the possibility that the decision to reward the children of the rich and punish the children of the poor is deliberate. In his novel, *World’s End*, T. C. Boyle delivers a simple and brutal portrayal of the essence of human society. Wealth and power, Boyle shows us, are the ultimate determinants of social reality; against wealth and power, ideals of justice and conceptions of right and wrong count, in the end, for nothing. We come away from Boyle’s novel hoping that he is wrong, but suspecting that that hope is its own form of willful blindness. If there’s only so much room at the top, why would those at the top invite the whole world up?

What is clear is that we don’t have the option of assuming that Boyle is right. The funding pattern of higher education in California is elitist and discriminatory, and is thus unjust. It is wrong. The issue of equity is a moral issue; it is not a fiscal one. We must attempt to make that inequity apparent to our leaders and to the public. We will assume that they do not know that injustice is being done. Only if it’s brought to their attention, and things don’t change, will we then know that Boyle was right. In that case, we can only hope to heal the butterflies by wresting power from those who now hold it.
papers (especially The California Articulation Number (CAN) System: Toward Increased Faculty Participation, adopted Spring 1998).

3. The Legislature passed (though at the writing of this article Governor Davis has not signed) AB 1603, calling for §71027.5 to be added to the Education Code, to read:

   The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the statewide Academic Senate, and using existing policies of shared governance, shall maintain the California Articulation Numbering System so that it serves as the common numbering system for California Community Colleges... so that it may be applied to all California Community College major preparation courses that are applicable courses for transfer to a four-year institution of higher education.

   Under new leadership and a new director, the CAN organization has much to accomplish. The systemwide efforts to further implement and enhance CAN will occur, irrespective of AB 1603's potential enactment into law: such implementing actions are responsive to student concerns, enable students to make better academic plans and choices, and are just plain sensible. Despite the claims of some that this new law would represent an unfunded mandate, much of the work to achieve its aims can—and is—being done already as part of the CAN processes, the IMPAC project reviews, increased articulation efforts by all segments, and ongoing, daily work of senate faculty, articulation officers, and transfer center directors. A list of suggested responsibilities of campus entities—including administrators, faculty, local senates, and students themselves—is being prepared for distribution. We urge the local senates to consider the challenges and suggestions posited by that document.

   DAP: At its Spring 2001 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate for Community Colleges endorsed the concepts of a dual admissions program proposed by the UC; a significant codicil appearing in the resolution underscored the need to identify the appropriate and significant resources prior to any implementation of the promising proposal. The UC Council of Academic Senators subsequently adopted a similar endorsement, carrying the same conditional request. The UC Board of Regents approved the proposal during this past summer; however, given the reduction of funding to all three higher education segments, the UC announced that this highly trumpeted proposal would be shelved for at least this coming year because of funding constraints.

   IMPAC: The IMPAC project continues to sponsor faculty-to-faculty dialogues to identify competencies and academic experiences of students transferring into the major at UC or CSU. The agreements reached by discipline faculty seek to ease transfer for our students by reducing duplication of courses or course content while simultaneously ensuring that our students are capable of successful work in the major upon transfer. IMPAC sponsors discipline discussions this year in these 16 disciplines: biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, agriculture, computer science, earth sciences, foodsciences/nutrition, nursing, CIS, criminal justice, business, economics, and political science, geography, and engineering. Funded by a grant, this transfer initiative is not jeopardized by the funding cuts sustained by our public segments. See www.cal-impac.org for more information.

   IGETC: The ICAS-supported research evaluating the success of IGETC (The Use, Effectiveness, and Awareness of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC): An Evaluation) was published and subsequently presented Fall 2000 Plenary Session. The report documented the overall student satisfaction with the IGETC option. This academic year, IMPAC faculty will consider the creation of an IGETC-like path for high-unit science major. Now playfully dubbed SciGETC, this concept is only in its infancy but has received enthusiastic support in IMPAC discussions thus far.

ON THE HORIZON

   CSU Dual Admissions: Presently Academic Senate representatives are participating with CSU faculty colleagues and system representatives to discuss the plausibility of a CSU Dual Admissions program. This plan will be discussed at a breakout at this fall's plenary session, November 1-3 in Cerritos. While the CSU dual admissions project appears to be on CSU’s fast track, many implementation
A number of exciting innovations have been developing in California’s community colleges, especially with the help of Partnership for Excellence funds and supportive administrators. Over the past few years the Basic Skills Committee has featured many of these programs and approaches at Academic Senate plenary sessions. Included in these breakout sessions has been a variety of learning communities, in-class tutoring, integrated learning centers, and student success advisors.

The Fall 2001 Plenary Session will once again occasion a breakout that will help improve community college basic skills instruction. This one will highlight what we have learned in the past few years from data collection, both at the state level and at local colleges. We can benefit from finding what approaches are supported by data, expanding successful use of data, and developing better ways to share those data. Perhaps we can propose models for gathering data that can be used for both formative and summative assessment.

To generate important data, the Basic Skills Committee has distributed a new survey on practices in basic skills instruction at local campuses statewide, a refined follow-up to its 1998 survey. This survey has already reached your campus. If you have not received a copy, please contact the Senate Office or visit our website. The deadline to return the survey is November 9, 2001. Your timely response will assist the Basic Skills Committee in this very important work.

In addition, the Basic Skills Committee has begun developing a paper on the best instructional practices for helping under-prepared students succeed in their course work. Those who teach reading, writing, and mathematics should find this paper useful. Anyone interested in working on the content of this paper is certainly welcome. Please contact Mark Snowhite at msnowhit@sbcdd.cc.ca.us.

questions remain, and primary among them are issues of resources—human and fiscal.

While the faculty-shaped and faculty-driven efforts continue rather harmoniously, the discordant note is the economic plight experienced by our state and collaterally within our segments. While politicians last year piled extraordinary pressures on our systems to increase “transfer numbers,” some among them seemed particularly insensitive to the costs associated with improving transfer rates: ASSIST, whose work is essential for transfer and for CAN itself, was denied a budget augmentation and its current budget is nearly one-half million dollars below what is needed simply to maintain its efforts; PFE funding was not increased; and, of course, while CSU and UC sustained budget reductions, the quality of education within the California community colleges was threatened by both the initial slashing of our base budget by $98 million and by the increasing injustice of FTES funding below the national average and far below that of our transfer partners.

Further, if history is any indication, periods of economic downturn generate additional need for displaced workers to build their skills or retrain for new employment. This would not appear the time to reduce our potential to serve our communities, rather the time to augment the efforts to fulfill our mission—ALL of our missions. Given, then, the limitations of our fiscal conditions—whether or not the subsequent bill for full budget restoration is signed—the Academic Senate must unite to withstand undue pressures, to be certain that the political interests in transfer do not overshadow the broader educational needs of the millions of other students who enter our doors.

by Mark Snowhite, Basic Skills Committee Chair
Firstly, I would like to use this article to introduce myself to some of you, and to explain my new role to others. Currently, the Executive Committee does not include an occupational faculty member. However, the Executive Committee feels strongly that the interests of occupational faculty throughout the state are best served when the chair of the Senate’s Occupational Education Committee is an established Executive Committee member. During discussions regarding whether to appoint an Executive Committee member or an occupational education faculty member from the field, the Executive Committee felt that an Executive Committee member would immediately focus the attention of the President and the Executive Committee on the many rapidly changing occupational issues. I am honored and excited to serve as the chair of the Occupational Education Committee for 2001 - 02. As many of you know, I have been the chair of the Senate’s Technology Committee for three years and have developed a solid working relationship with the Chancellor’s Office. I hope I can use this base of experience to successfully represent occupational issues at the political level. And I have a fine team of occupational faculty to keep me updated on specific details.

Joining me this year on the Occupational Education Committee are:
- Jane Thompson (Business, Solano College)
- Mark Lieu (ESL, Ohlone College)
- Beth Regardz (Digital Media, Cabrillo College)
- Steve Brown (Drafting Technology, College of the Redwoods)
- Warren Carter (Broadcast, Golden West College)
- Shaaron Vogel (Nursing, Butte College).

It promises to be a dynamic team.

The Committee is currently working on three position papers carried over by last year’s committee and hopes to bring them to a plenary session for adoption this year. As you are well aware, Senate position papers are the ideal vehicle to bring issues to the attention of a wider audience. Last spring a breakout session gathered input for a paper on ED>Net and this paper is currently being revised. Over the summer the Committee has been working hard with a paper on WIA, RWPEDA and One-Stops. It hopes to bring a draft for input to the Fall Plenary Session in Cerritos in November. The third paper will consider best practices in CalWORKS.

One of the major issues at the level of the Board of Governors is last year’s initiative on “A Career Ladder Approach to Workforce Development.” This effort was spearheaded by board member Amy Dean and included then Senate President Linda Collins in the writing team that produced the framing document. This year we expect to work with implementation and funding plans as the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors consider them. An update on this Initiative will be presented at the 2001 Fall Plenary Session.

Building on the outstanding success of last year’s Occupational Faculty Leadership Seminar in Santa Cruz the Committee is currently considering plans for this year, including the possibility of both a North and a South venue, and appropriate dates and content. Watch our website as details develop.

The Committee is also monitoring work at the Chancellor’s Office Workforce and Economic Development Advisory Committee (WEDAC) on which there are six Senate appointees and ED>Net on which there are, for the first time, three Senate appointees.

And finally, one of the most important goals of this year’s Committee is to elect an occupational faculty member to Executive Committee in the spring elections. Please contact me if you are interested in running for election, or if there are other issues I can help you with.
This past spring, the Consultation Council recognized the need to form a Task Force to determine whether students have adequate access to counseling services in California and whether the services are of the kinds and levels needed to help assure their success. Maybe Consultation recognized the need because of the possible layoffs of counseling faculty in light of the Audit of the 50% Law or maybe it was because of the consistent focus on the shortage of counseling faculty. We are not sure, but are glad it has been formed and declared an academic and professional matter where the Senate has the lead.

The Task Force is comprised of representatives from several organizations in Consultation and has already begun its work. In July, a survey of counseling faculty assignments was developed and mailed to campuses to collect data on assessing the access of students to counseling services. This data will be used in a report to the Consultation Council. The survey was mailed to all CSSOs and matriculation deans and asked the appropriate administrator, working with the Department Chair of Counseling, to submit information using the Fall 2000 Full-Time Faculty Obligation Report numbers for individual colleges. The Chancellor’s Office will be reminding colleges that have not submitted a survey to please participate in this very important data gathering effort.

In addition, a private list serve for all community college counseling faculty in California, including adjuncts, has been created. If you are interested in taking part, please send counseling faculty names to Lindy Williams, Dean of Student Services in the Chancellor’s Office at lwilliam@CCCCO.edu.

Similarly, the Task Force is developing questions for a fall semester survey of all California community college counseling faculty. It hopes that study will provide an accurate snapshot of what is currently happening in the field. Watch for more information on the work of this Task Force.

Local Senates

continued from p. 3

Senate website and at plenary sessions.” Committee members argued that this charge can be more effectively and successfully carried out if personal connections with the local senates are established and nourished. Many resolutions arising from session call upon the Academic Senate to disseminate information (e.g., about AAUP), to research and publicize best practices (e.g., for integrating part-time faculty into local senates, for effective projects carried out under the aegis of PFE funds), and to work more directly with local senates on protecting their statutory responsibilities for academic and professional matters. Such work, the Committee determined, is best conducted under diligent, one-on-one, face-to-face contacts with faculty members on their home campuses.

In the coming weeks, local senate presidents will receive additional information about our desire to visit with you, to learn from you about the successes of your work with and on behalf of students. We—both Executive Committee participants and Committee members—look forward to working more personally with you. In the meantime, the Relations with Local Senates Committee will fulfill its other responsibilities determined by session resolutions.
and effective. However, the Handbook, as it is currently written, is based on regulations that have been put into question for now. It remains to be seen what the outcome will be of the Board of Governor’s appeal of the appellate ruling to the California Supreme Court. No further consideration of the Handbook would make sense until it is decided what regulations are invalid. As President Simpson has reminded us in his recent email to the field, until there is a final resolution of the legal situation, the current regulations remain in effect. Most important, the obligation to hire without discriminating against people based on their ethnicity, gender, or disability is definitely still an obligation. The AA/CD Committee has several proposals for new ways to strengthen fairness in hiring in ways consistent with this and other recent court decisions. These ideas and recommendations will be circulated to the field in conjunction with one or more resolutions.

We will also be discussing the Student Equity Grant from the Chancellor’s Office—its charge is the preparation of a student equity handbook. Equity for community college students is a top priority for the Academic Senate, as is evidenced by the theme for the 2001 Fall Plenary Session, Community Colleges: Equity for the Top 100%. However, before we undertake the task of writing guidelines for a model Student Equity Plan, several questions have to be dealt with. When the first Student Equity Handbook was written in 1992-93, college districts were required to have a student equity plan. Now that requirement no longer exists. Moreover, most of the existing plans are not worthwhile. The question is, are we in a position to recommend good programs in the absence of model programs on various campuses? Last year’s student equity turn-around survey did not yield sufficient information. In addition, the Chancellor’s Office has given a $300,000 grant to City College of San Francisco to prepare precisely the kind of report on student success that we are being asked to prepare for $10,000. Lastly, what good is a plan if there is no incentive or legal compliance attached to it? These and possibly other questions will have to be discussed and answered before the committee goes ahead with the project of revising guidelines for implementing Student Equity plans.

I would like to end this brief report on a more personal note. A new climate prevails in the nation since the terror attacks of September 11, 2001. This period of mourning and resolve has had a cathartic effect on the national psyche. We see television images of rallying and rebuilding in the midst of destruction and loss, and this gives us a sense of unity, strength, and purpose. The classrooms are becoming more serious in delving into important issues. However, this period is also an opportune moment for some to vent their prejudice and hatred against certain immigrant groups, including people who have been American citizens for generations. We need to protect not only our national interest, but also our very human interests such as civil liberties, non-violent conflict resolution, and academic freedom.
Technology Committee

While the California Community College System did not receive the requested Technology II budget for 2001-2002, all colleges have been actively involved in planning for the use of these funds, which we hope to receive in the 2002-2003 budget. As technology continues to play a greater role in the educational process, access to technology becomes an ever more important issue. One of the goals of the Technology Committee this year is to work with the Educational Policies Committee to respond to the Spring 2001 Plenary resolution, “Conduct research to investigate the impact of technology on student access and success in the California Community College System, particularly as it relates to ethnic and socioeconomic diversity and students with disabilities; and report back in a paper the research findings and recommended solutions to any problems identified.” The importance of the access issue is reflected not only in the Academic Senate’s concerns, but in the funding the Chancellor’s Office has given for each college to hire a DSPS High Technology Support Program specialist to work with colleges to make sure that disabled students have access to assistive technologies and that websites are designed to work with assistive technologies.

Many of the members of the Technology Committee will also serve on Chancellor’s Office advisory committees. The Distance Education Technical Advisory Committee (DETAC) has finished its five-year review of distance education programs and has submitted Title 5 language changes to the Consultation Council to formalize such changes as the “personal contact” to “effective contact” for teachers and students in distance education courses. The Technology Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) will discuss systemwide technology projects and the budget. Your representatives on these committees will continue to ensure faculty input and instructional quality and integrity.

Finally, your Technology Committee will be working to bring breakouts to the fall and spring plenary sessions of the Academic Senate on such topics as technology and educational policy, demonstrations of individual faculty technology activities, and Chancellor’s Office projects.

Senate Websites

The Academic Senate Office has been extremely busy over the summer. If you have not visited our website recently, I suggest you do so. Along with the constantly evolving session and institute information, we have added many new features. I would like to highlight just a couple of them available from the main Academic Senate website. First, we have added an interactive map of California that shows the location of each community college campus and includes a link to the local senate website. If your website is not listed on the map, please forward it to our Senate Office, so that it can be posted on the new map. Second, we are constantly adding to the collection of Academic Senate publications available for download from our website. While our new publications are posted on the website immediately, the Senate’s ultimate goal is to archive all of its 30 years worth of publications online. Over the summer, the Senate staff has been scanning and proofing documents that would constitute this valuable resource. We hope to have all the older documents posted by the end of the year. Third, the website now contains a searchable resolution database. This database currently contains only resolutions adopted in the last 6 years. We hope to have all the Senate’s resolutions posted by the end of the year.
resolutions included on this database in the very near future. Currently you can search our resolution database by keyword and session date. The last feature I would like to highlight is the development of an online database directory. The resource allows faculty and general audience to access essential information about each community college, link to its main and local senate websites, and look up current local senate representatives. This directory also allows local senate presidents and staff the ability to update their information online instead of filling out and mailing paper forms. We anticipate that the directory will be fully functional by the time of this publication. If you are an academic senate president, you will be notified of a password to access this new feature. As you can see, we have been very busy on our Senate website. Please take some time and visit our site.

Next, we have recently redesigned the site for curriculum developers, which is now available at www.curriculum.cc.ca.us. This site has a wealth of resources for curriculum designers. It is anticipated that the Curriculum Committee will begin to review model course outlines that will soon be posted on this site to serve as a constantly evolving reference for those who are directly involved in writing course outlines. If you have a model course outline, please send it to Elton Hall, Curriculum Committee Chair, at ehall@vcccd.net. The site has also been updated with the recently revised Chancellor’s Office Curriculum Standards Handbook that is now called Program and Course Approval Handbook. To ease access to rich resources available from this site the search feature is provided on this site to instantly link you to the information you are looking for. Please visit this new website and send us any suggestions.

The Senate has yet another website for the IMPAC Project available at www.cal-impac.org. This website contains information about the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum project. The project is now in its second year. If you do not know about the project, please visit the IMPAC website to get the background information, read reports from discipline meetings, and learn about the future of the project.

Last but not least is our newest website dedicated to the work of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS is comprised of the Academic Senate presidents/chairs of UC, CSU and CCC. Each year the chair rotates to the next segment. This year the CCC, Hoke Simpson, is chairing ICAS. ICAS is the intersegmental statewide body that addresses common interests across the segments. Visit the website at www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/icas.html to find out more about ICAS and watch the issues as they develop.

On a personal note, I would like to thank our talented webmaster, Rita Rasskazova. Rita joined my team over two years ago and has continuously raised the bar on our websites and publications. The websites have all been created and maintained by Rita. Each new design contains her imagination and dedication. Thank you Rita. If you get an opportunity, please join me in thanking Rita for her wonderful work. Her email address is ascccdesign@mindspring.com.