THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED

UNITY, EQUITY, QUALITY, AND EFFICIENCY IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor

COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
1215 FIFTEENTH STREET, SECOND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-0132

J. Gary Shansby
Chairman

Willlam D. Campbell
Vice Chairman

Commissioners

Seth P. Brunner
Henry Der
Patsy Estrellas
Claudia Hampton, Ed.D.
Bill Honlg
Meredith J. Khachlglan
George Davld Kleffer, Esq.
Felix S. LeMarlnel
Peter A. McCuen, Ph.D.
Edward R. Mosley, M.D.
Michael R. Peevey
Ray Remy
Glenn Rothner
Harold M. WIlllams

Executive Director
Lee R. Kerschner, Ph.D.

July, 1987

The Honorable George Deukmejian
Governor, State of California

The Honorable David A. Roberti
President pro Tempore of the Senate

The Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Gentlemen:

The Commission has completed its review of California's Master Plan for Higher Education and hereby transmits its report, The *Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education,* to the Governor and the Legislature pursuant to Chapter 1507, Statutes of 1984. The Commission adopted its report with but one dissenting vote.

The Commission reaffirms the unique and timeless foundation for postsecondary education originally established in the 1960 Master Plan. Delineation of mission and function among the public segments and protection against unhealthy intersegmental competition will help ensure the future success of California postsecondary education.

Within this framework, our report contains recommended modifications to carry California postsecondary education into the 21st century. Changing demographics, need for a better educated citizenry, increased demand for more highly trained workers, and the evolution toward a global society are the basis of these recommendations.

Early in our deliberations, we concluded that postsecondary education and the public schools are closely interdependent parts of one educational system and that the success of each depends on the other. Thus, although our statutory charge is limited to postsecondary education, our recommendations occasionally affect the public schools as well. We view postsecondary education as a key to providing better teachers, more useful research, and expanded outreach programs for the improvement of the public schools.

The Commission is grateful to all who provided information, analysis, and testimony to assist in our deliberations. We particularly appreciate the detailed studies and advice provided by the staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the advice and information provided by the California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, the student organizations, the faculty organizations (in particular the academic senates), and numerous other higher education and public school organizations and individuals.

The Commission is especially indebted to its staff and consultants, who provided comprehensive background and issue papers under intense pressure and very short timelines. The final report, however, is the work of the Commission and represents its careful consideration of each of the various issues.

It has been a pleasure for all of us to serve on the Commission. We gained valuable knowledge of postsecondary education in California and believe we have made substantial contributions to strengthening the system.

The reforms we propose are essential to meeting current and foreseeable future changes. In time, however, further changes in the educational system are likely to be necessary. We therefore recommend that early in the 21st century a new commission be established to develop a Master Plan for all California education, preschool through Ph.D., public and private.

We stand ready to discuss our recommendations at your convenience and look forward to a thorough examination of the issues.

Sincerely Yours,

J. Gary Shansby
Chairman

THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED

UNITY, EQUITY, QUALITY, AND EFFICIENCY IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Commission for the Review of the
Master Plan for Higher Education

Sacramento, California
July 1987

THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED

Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education

Contents

		Page
Introduction		1
I.	Toward a Unified Educational System	7
II.	Toward Greater Equity	21
III.	Toward Enhancing Educational Quality	29
IV.	Toward More Efficient Use of Educational Resources	39
V.	Resources and Responsibility	47

Appendices:

A.	Supplementary Recommendations	A-1
B.	Recommended Studies	B-1
C.	Estimated Costs of the Commission's Recommendations	C-1
D.	Commissioner Comments and Dissents	D-1
E.	The Commission and Its Process	E-1
F.	Authorizing Legislation: SB 1570 Nielsen; Chapter 1507,1984	F-1

Introduction

A vital, comprehensive, accessible, and excellent educational system is essential to the cultural, political, and economic health of a nation or state. Educational institutions provide the basic and specialized training necessary for an advanced workforce. They help to establish the common values underlying a stable, responsive political system. They nurture the creative talents essential to cultural richness and to scientific advance.

California has a population that is exceedingly rich in ethnic and cultural diversity. This diversity is a resource that must be carefully and sensitively developed to ensure the continued success of our state as a society and as a world leader. As we approach the 21st century, our interaction with the rest of the world will demand the entrepreneurship, multiple talents, language abilities, and understanding of other cultures that a diverse society offers. We believe our renowned system of postsecondary education, working in concert with the public schools, is key to developing that resource.

California's Postsecondary Educational Enterprise

In the last 25 years, California has developed an extraordinary educational system. From preschool through the postgraduate level, from the traditional classroom to televised in-home courses, education is the largest, most comprehensive social institution in the state.

At the postsecondary level, the scope of the enterprise is particularly impressive. The nine-campus University of California is one of the world's premier public research universities. The California State University, with 19 campuses and many off-campus centers, is one of the nation's preeminent public teaching institutions. The 106 California Community Colleges have served as the model for community-based lower-division academic and vocational instruction in this country and other nations. The state's 181 independent accredited degree-granting private colleges and universities include superb undergraduate teaching institutions and national and world leaders in scholarship and research. In addition, there are 265 accredited private occupational schools as well as many other state-authorized or approved but nonaccredited education providers.

Together, these institutions spend more than $15 billion annually. For this amount, they produce some 50,000 graduates with associates in arts degrees, 86,000 with baccalaureate degrees, 28,000 with masters degrees, 6,800 with professional degrees, 9,000 with doctorates, and a vast number of students with the occupational

training required for jobs in industry, commerce, finance, agriculture, government, and many other fields.

Over the past twenty-five years, this comprehensive, diversified educational enterprise has functioned in reasonable harmony under the state's Master Plan for Higher Education. The authors of the 1960 Plan, recognizing the strain that unprecedented growth in the 1960s and '70s would place on the system, crafted a unique blueprint to ensure quality and efficiency through a careful delineation of institutional functions and through prevention of disruptive competition among the public segments.

Unforeseen Changes

Since 1960, however, economic and social conditions have changed dramatically in ways that could not have been foreseen by the original planners.

In 1960, the public schools were not recognized as a significant issue for higher education. The school system was believed to function reasonably well, college students were adequately prepared, and little was heard about dropout problems, inadequate teacher preparation, or the need to improve the public school curriculum. Since then, our judgements and expectations have changed profoundly, and all of these matters are now the subject of vigorous debate.

The 1960 Master Plan provided access to higher education to unprecedented numbers of students. It was, however, still assumed that college was for an ethnically homogeneous population of financially able, well-prepared, 18-22 year olds. California's dramatically changing ethnic make-up was not foreseen, nor was the fact that growing numbers of older and part-time students would enter the educational system.

The emerging Community Colleges (known then as Junior Colleges) had academic instruction as their primary function. The 1960 Master Plan policy of diversion of students to those colleges was seen as an efficient and effective way to educate lower-division students prior to their transfer to the four-year colleges and universities. Today, the transfer function, still so essential to the health of the postsecondary system, is beginning to atrophy.

In 1960, the rapid growth of academic research and graduate education and its implications for undergraduate instruction were not widely understood. Professors were still assumed to be scholar-teachers whose first priority was to their students and to the undergraduate curriculum. The concern that undergraduate teaching was being sacrificed to the pursuit of leadership in graduate training and research was not resolved -- it continues to be a major issue in California as throughout the nation.

The 1960 Master Plan said little about the role of the postsecondary schools, colleges, and universities in the accredited private sector, Since then, the accredited private sector has also grown rapidly and can no longer be left out of the plan. In the coming years, the state must acknowledge the accredited private institutions' ability to shoulder much of the increasing demand for educational services, and the accredited private institutions must be encouraged to accept that responsibility as partners in a unified enterprise.

Finally, while the 1960 Master Plan was successful in stemming unhealthy intersegmental competition, the coordinating agency it produced could not both ensure harmony within the system and maintain the confidence of those outside the system. When the agency was subsequently reestablished as a predominantly lay commission (and thus gained the confidence of those outside the system), it no longer provided a forum in which segmental leaders could develop cooperative methods of addressing their common concerns. A valuable agency for evaluation and policy analysis, it cannot be the unifying body that is now so clearly needed.

Updating the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education

In addition to the many important changes that have occurred since 1960, it is clear that we can expect new challenges to our postsecondary education system in the future. California is rapidly becoming a highly diverse society with all of the benefits and problems that entails. It is this Commission's firm belief, however, that California's increasingly diverse population is a great asset for the state and the nation. In fact, the continued prosperity of American society may well depend on the diversity of its population.

Yet, a highly diverse, postindustrial society will also demand ever more advanced skills in industry, commerce, agriculture, finance, government, and other fields. It will demand, too, more firmly held common values and a deeper understanding of the currents of social, cultural, and political change that will continue to shape the lives of peoples and nations for centuries to come as they have for centuries past.

Education obviously will play a major role in determining how well we respond to these challenges. Thus, the Master Plan must be renewed in several fundamental ways. It must maintain but also build upon the successful elements of the 1960 plan with major new provisions that respond to and meet new challenges. To this end, the Commission recommends changes that are directed toward the achievement of four principal goals:

- **Unity,** to assure that all elements of the system work together in pursuit of common educational goals;
- **Equity,** to assure that all Californians have unrestricted opportunity to fulfill their educational potential and aspirations;

- **Quality,** to assure that excellence characterizes every aspect of the system; and
- **Efficiency,** to assure the most productive use of finite financial and human resources.

These goals cannot be imposed by the Legislature or the Governor. Instead, they must be accepted and internalized by the institutions, their faculties, administrators, and especially by their governing boards.

Unity

Section 1, titled "Toward A Unified Educational System," calls for unity among the segments in providing an educational system that is fully responsive to the needs of all Californians. This requires strong structural links among all of the segments in the areas of policy formulation, operations, and evaluation. The policy formulation and evaluation linkages are in place; missing is the operational linkage. We recommend a new voluntary solution.

The Commission has carefully reexamined the roles and missions of the public and private segments in light of the changes that have occurred and may be expected as California approaches the 21st century. Much of what was said in 1960 may be reaffirmed. But the responsibilities of each segment, including the accredited independent and private schools, need clarification. We recommend clearer mission statements.

The ability of the segments to carry out their assigned functions is in many ways dependent upon their admission policies. Here, also, the Commission believes that the policies established in the 1960 Master Plan continue, in general, to be valid. A key element, maintaining lower-division enrollment in the four-year institutions at 40 percent or less of undergraduate enrollment, was subsequently ignored in the pursuit of other priorities. We recommend its reestablishment.

The ability of qualified students to advance from lower-division instruction in a community college to upper-division instruction in a four-year institution is the heart of the California Master Plan. That provision has been allowed to atrophy. We recommend guaranteed access to the baccalaureate degree for qualified students.

The Community Colleges, with a weak governance system, have been unable to carry out their full responsibilities within the postsecondary educational system. The success of the whole system depends on them. Their governing structure must be strengthened substantially and held accountable for the successful operation of the colleges as full partners in the postsecondary

education enterprise. We recommend an expanded and strengthened Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges.

Equity

In Section II, titled "Toward Greater Equity," the Commission confronts the fact that many of our citizens -- particularly Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians -- continue to be underrepresented in the postsecondary system. Not only are the underrepresented groups themselves severely disadvantaged by societal barriers to educational opportunity, but the entire state suffers because of its failure to draw upon the talents of all of its citizens. Educational equity must be a central priority for our educational institutions. There must be total commitment to equity as our postsecondary institutions strive to create environments that give each person, regardless of race, sex, age, or economic circumstances, a reasonable chance to fully develop his or her potential. We recommend new commitments and new guarantees.

Quality

Section III, titled "Toward Enhancing Educational Quality," addresses the importance of quality at all levels of education but particularly in the public schools and in undergraduate instruction. Postsecondary education has responsibility for improving instruction in the public schools through improvement in the training of teachers, basic research into methods of teaching and learning, and the encouragement of professional service to the schools by college and university faculty. We recommend changes in higher education that will improve the public schools.

Excellence in undergraduate instruction is often sacrificed to the pursuit of excellence in research. The undergraduate curriculum, particularly at the lower-division level, is frequently fragmented and incoherent. General liberal arts and sciences education has been lost in this era of undergraduate specialization. Teaching is too often neglected, and faculty and teaching assistants are not trained to teach. We recommend new commitments to excellence in teaching.

Efficiency

In Section IV, titled "Toward More Efficient Use of Educational Resources," the Commission emphasizes cost containment, effective pricing and student aid policies, equitable budgeting, and, perhaps most importantly, systematic and continued long-range planning. Certainly in an enterprise as large as postsecondary education in California, wasteful duplication and excessive spending are problems to be reckoned with. Every effort must be made to

eliminate unnecessary duplication and to contain rising costs. We recommend actions to assure the taxpayers that their money is wisely spent.

Many of these changes can be implemented without additional cost and some will result in long-term and substantial savings to the taxpayers. Others will require new resources, but the relatively modest increases in expenditures proposed here will pay large dividends to the state in terms of a highly-trained, well-educated populace with enhanced opportunities for social, political, and economic growth. If the needed resources are to be available, however, it is likely that Article XIIIB of the California Constitution must be modified or repealed. In the future, as in the past, California's strength will depend heavily upon its willingness to invest in the education of its citizens, young and old, native and immigrant.

I. Toward A Unified Educational System

California's educational system is not unified. It consists of many diverse institutions, organized under separate governing boards, that are heavily interdependent and sometimes cooperative but more often operate independently. There is strength in this independence, but we cannot meet the needs of an increasingly diverse California without enhanced cooperation among all our educational institutions. Above all, there must be a policy consensus that from preschool to doctorate, public and private, we are one system.

The evidence is clear. The elementary and secondary schools depend upon the quality of teachers educated in the colleges and universities. The colleges and universities are dependent upon university graduate programs for the quality of their faculties, and they are dependent upon the public schools for adequately prepared students. The admission requirements at each level strongly influence the instructional standards at the preceding level. The success of the whole enterprise is heavily dependent upon the extent to which qualified students from all backgrounds are encouraged to progress through the system. Institutions in the private sector are strongly affected by policies and practices of the public institutions, and the public institutions are influenced by competition from and cooperation with private institutions.

If this diverse system is to function effectively, its segments must be linked together in a manner that reflects their essential unity. There must be a policy formulation linkage; there must be an operational linkage; and there must be an evaluation linkage.

The Missing Link

Policy formulation at the highest level is the shared responsibility of the Governor and the Legislature. The California Postsecondary Education Commission is the appropriate agency to provide the evaluation linkage. What is missing is the operational linkage. CPEC cannot provide this linkage as long as its primary function is to advise the Governor and Legislature as to the functioning of the segments. To do so effectively, it must evaluate institutions and programs objectively, something it could not do with respect to programs it administers.

The existing educational structure is complex; some of it is firmly embedded in the state's constitution, some created in statute, and some established through private association. A constitutional amendment would be required to create a new public body that could provide reliable operational coordination. Such a recommendation would have been advanced had it been deemed necessary, but the Commission firmly

believes that there is a better choice: voluntary coordination at the highest executive level.

An appropriate voluntary body, the California Education Round Table, made up of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, the Chairman of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and the Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, has recently been formed. With this membership and the will to succeed, this body should be able to effect a large measure of cooperation and collaboration among the segments. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

1. The California Education Round Table shall be recognized as the body responsible for providing the necessary operational linkage for the state's educational system.[1] Among the most pressing matters that must be addressed by this body are:

- **Establishing an agenda for practical and broad-based research into methods of improving instruction and reducing the dropout rate in the elementary and secondary schools;**
- **Overseeing formal consultation among the segments regarding changes in admissions requirements and establishing an articulation mechanism to eliminate obstacles to student progress through the system;**
- **Overseeing intersegmental programs established to foster equity throughout the educational enterprise;**
- **Assuring support for coordinated outreach programs in the public schools;**
- **Assuring support for cooperative curriculum development programs involving elementary and secondary school teachers and college and university faculties;**
- **Overseeing statewide, coordinated development and application of new information technology networks to meet instructional and other needs within and among the public and private sectors; and**
- **Creating and overseeing an Intersegmental Degree Programs Board to guide studies of the need for and expanded development of intersegmental degree programs.[2]**

[1] For further detail, see Appendix A, item 1.
[2] For further detail, see Appendix A, item 2.

The Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission shall sit ex officio, without vote. The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall report biennially to the Governor, the Legislature, and the segments on the effectiveness of the Round Table in performing its tasks.

The effectiveness of the Round Table in carrying out its responsibilities must be evaluated on a continuing basis. The California Postsecondary Education Commission is the appropriate agency to carry out this function, but the CPEC director then cannot be a party to the decisions of the Round Table.

Missions Within a Unified System

The principal functions of postsecondary education are instruction and research. Instruction is the primary function of all but the research university, which must give equal attention to both instruction and research. The encouragement of scholarship, creative activity, and public service are responsibilities of every postsecondary institution and are understood by the Commission to be integral to instruction and research.

The Commission has carefully reexamined the roles and missions of California's public and private postsecondary institutions in light of the changes that have occurred and may be expected as the state approaches the 21st century. Much of what is in the Master Plan may be reaffirmed, but the Commission believes that the mission of each of the public segments should be stated with greater clarity in terms of its contribution to instruction and research within a unified system.

The Commission believes it is important to state the instructional responsibilities of the public schools in this context and to assign principal responsibility for vocational instruction to the Community Colleges. The secondary schools should continue to offer general vocational education, but the evidence is clear that as our economy continues to mature the Community Colleges must take the lead in training men and women for specific occupations. Responsibility for short-term job training shall continue to be shared by the Community Colleges and Regional Occupational Programs and Centers.

The Commission has studied, in depth, the issue of providing greater access to the doctoral degree and has concluded that the need will be met best by expanding intersegmental degree programs. Therefore, the Commission has specifically charged the California Education Round Table with creating and overseeing an Intersegmental Degree Programs Board and has outlined the composition and responsibilities of the Board in advocating an expanded use of the intersegmental degree.

The new mission statements must also clarify the role of the California State University with respect to the research that is appropriate for a teaching university

faculty. The 1960 Master Plan left ambiguous the state's commitment to support research at CSU. CSU is a very different institution than it was when the 1960 Master Plan was written. It offers undergraduate and graduate courses of great breadth and depth. The CSU faculty, with appropriate state support, has much to contribute through research to its students and to society in general. In view of the size of CSU's teacher education programs, it is particularly important that faculty from all disciplines contribute to public school improvement through research in elementary and secondary instruction and in the application of new instructional technologies. The public schools are heavily invested in the use of new instructional technologies, and the new teaching staffs must be knowledgable in the effective application of those technologies. The University of California faculty must also contribute its research, teaching, and professional skills to improve public school instruction.

The Commission also believes that the accredited degree-granting independent colleges and universities and the accredited occupational schools must be included as the fourth and fifth segments of the postsecondary system. Among the accredited degree-granting colleges and universities are some of the nation's leading independent institutions. These and the many accredited private vocational training schools offer quality educational opportunities that are not provided by public institutions, and together they serve large numbers of students who in their absence would have to be accommodated in public institutions at the taxpayers' expense. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

2. The missions of the public and accredited private segments shall be as follows:

- **The public and private elementary and secondary schools shall be responsible for academic and general vocational instruction through the 12th grade, including preparation for postsecondary instruction and general and academic preparation for their students' future participation in the labor market, and such adult instruction as the state is resolved to support.**

- **The California Community Colleges shall offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower-division level for the great majority of "college-age" and older students. In addition, they shall provide remedial instruction for students inadequately prepared for postsecondary education, state-supported noncredit instruction as deemed appropriate by the Board of Governors,[3] and fee-supported community service**

[3] For further detail, see Appendix B, item 1.

instruction. The Community Colleges shall have principal but not exclusive responsibility for vocational education.

- **The California State University shall offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional education, including teacher education, through the master's degree. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California or with a private institution of postsecondary education, provided it is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. (Joint doctoral programs may be recommended by the Intersegmental Degree Programs Board, as well as by the individual segments.) Research, scholarship, and creative activity in support of its undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in the California State University and shall be supported by the state.[4] The California State University shall have a particular responsibility among the public institutions for research in elementary and secondary instruction and for conducting research related to the instructional use of new technology;[5] the state shall also support these research responsibilities.[4]**

- **The University of California shall offer undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction and professional education through the doctoral degree. It shall have exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over instruction in the profession of law and over graduate instruction in the professions of medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. It shall have sole authority among the public segments to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University to award joint doctoral degrees subject to approval of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The University of California shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research.**

[4] This is not meant to exclude support from nonstate funds.

[5] Declineation of CSU's rcsearch rcsponsiblities does not absolve the University of California from its responsibilities in these areas.

- **The independent, accredited degree-granting colleges, universities, and professional schools shall provide undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in accordance with their missions.**

- **The private, accredited occupational schools shall provide vocational instruction according to established accreditation standards.**

- **All segments of education are responsible for ensuring that students who are willing and able to prepare themselves for advancement through the system have full and equal opportunity to do so. All three public postsecondary segments may determine that it is necessary to provide remedial instruction, but the public schools have primary responsibility through their regular programs and adult schools for preparing students for postsecondary work.**[6]

A Unified Admissions and Transfer System

The authors of the 1960 Master Plan, foreseeing an unprecedented surge of enrollment in public higher education, decided that a large number of lower-division students (50,000 by their estimate) should be redirected to what were then the Junior Colleges. They believed that this would be good for the students (by enhancing access and quality) as well as for the taxpayers (the alternative was to construct several additional four-year campuses or greatly enlarge existing campuses). It was to be accomplished by reducing the eligibility pool for each four-year segment and by asking each to reduce its lower-division enrollment to 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment by 1975. The means of achieving the 40 percent goal were left to each segment to determine.

The redirection policy was based on the belief that students accommodated in the Community Colleges would have the same opportunity to complete their lower-division studies and go on to upper-division study at a four-year institution as those admitted to the four-year institutions as freshmen. The authors of the policy noted explicitly "the high scholastic records made in both the state colleges (CSU) and the University (UC) by junior college transfers."

From 1960 through 1975, the California Community Colleges grew and prospered as intended under the 1960 Master Plan. Many students who were eligible to enter UC or CSU as freshmen, as well as others who were seeking a second chance, enrolled in a Community College for the first two years of undergraduate instruction. As a

[6] The need for remedial instruction, and for limitations on that instruction among the postsecondary institutions, is discussed in the next section of this report.

result, UC and CSU were able to meet the 40 percent goal for lower-division enrollment in 1975 as agreed upon in the Master Plan, and the Community Colleges were able to offer strong, comprehensive transfer programs. Throughout this period, and to the present day, the University of California and the California State University maintained the practice of admitting, some place within their systems, all eligible students who applied during the regular enrollment period.

In the mid-1970s, however, the number of high school graduates began to decline in California, as throughout the nation, and all postsecondary institutions were faced with the prospect of declining enrollments. Both UC and CSU did suffer some reductions in undergraduate enrollment but were able to recover quickly and continue to grow. The Community Colleges also continued to grow for several years, but only with important changes in their enrollment composition.

The total number of high school graduates continued to decline, and UC and CSU began to attract a larger percentage of the high school graduates who were eligible for admission as freshmen. Thus, fewer and fewer high school graduates enrolled as full-time transfer students in the Community Colleges. As enrollment in the transfer programs declined, those programs became less and less attractive to baccalaureate-bound students who might have enrolled, academic standards declined, and a downward spiral began. With the changes in Community College funding that followed passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, course offerings were reduced and counseling and testing services curtailed. The problem was only compounded by the efforts of some Community Colleges to so broaden their programs in search of enrollment that their real mission became obscured.

Now we are faced with the necessity of reversing this situation, of revitalizing the Community Colleges so that they can once again offer solid opportunities for students to progress through the system toward a baccalaureate degree. The Commission has recommended a number of actions directed at this objective: the intersegmentally-developed transfer core curriculum; mandatory assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up; minimum skill levels for all. courses; a more focused Community College mission statement; a stronger governing structure; etc.[7] But all of this will not succeed until and unless the Community Colleges attract a larger proportion of baccalaureate-bound students, and this will require the active assistance of the University of California and the California State University in changing the perception of the validity of the transfer option. There is widespread agreement with the 1960 Master Planners' statement that: "The quality of an institution and that of a system of higher education are determined to a considerable extent by the abilities of those it admits and retains as students."

It is the Commission's strong belief that the admission policy agreed upon in 1960 was correct then and is correct today. The Community Colleges have the physical capacity and, with the reforms that have been recommended by this Commission,

[7] See earlier Commission report., *The Challenge of Change.*

will have the academic capacity to absorb a large increase in lower-division transfer enrollment at substantially less cost than the University of California or the California State University. The Community Colleges will be revitalized by a rebuilding of their transfer programs. Initially underprepared students, including large numbers of underrepresented minority students, will benefit by gaining greater access to a baccalaureate degree through strong transfer programs in the Community Colleges, where the great majority of underrepresented minorities are enrolled.

Lower-division enrollment at the California State University is reported to be approximately 39 percent of total undergraduate enrollment. Therefore, no action is currently required of the California State University other than to maintain lower-division enrollment at or below 40 percent.

Lower-division enrollment at the University of California is approximately 46 percent of total undergraduate enrollment. Therefore, the University of California must take steps, in partnership with the Community Colleges and the California State University, to reinvigorate transfer programs and progress as rapidly as possible toward a lower-division of not more than 40 percent. For UC to do so, however, will require the strengthening of the Community College transfer programs as recommended by the Commission, and the Community Colleges and the University of California will need time to take the steps necessary to effect these changes. The Commission is confident that effective steps can be taken and the Community College transfer programs returned to their vital role in the Master Plan, thus enhancing student choice among the segments for which they are eligible.

Finally, it has become clear over the past ten years that all public segments of postsecondary education must work together in planning and administering their admissions polices -- that there must be, in effect, a unified admissions and transfer system. The policies and requirements of each public segment, and especially the most selective segment, have too great an impact on the others to permit each to operate autonomously. Thus, there must be a strong commitment to work in concert to make the admission system and transfer programs work. *Therefore, the Commission recommends:*

3. The admission policy of each of the public segments shall be as follows:

- **The California Community Colleges shall remain open to all high school graduates and others at least eighteen years of age capable of profiting from the instruction offered. It shall be the basic policy of the state that all Community College students shall have access to the Community College of their choice without regard to district boundaries.**

- **The California State University shall select first-time freshmen from those who rank among the top one-third of all California public high school graduates, with graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools held to at least equivalent levels.**

- **The University of California shall select first-time freshmen from those who rank among the top one-eighth of all California public high school graduates, with graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools held to at least equivalent levels.**

- **Both four-year segments shall maintain lower-division enrollment systemwide at no more than 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment. The means of achieving this goal is left to each segment to determine. In determining eligibility and selection, both segments shall consider criteria and procedures that recognize skills, talents, knowledge, and the potential for success and shall advise prospective applicants and school counselors of those criteria. Both segments shall continue to use special admissions involving exceptions to these rules to increase the participation rates of underrepresented groups.**

- **The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall continue to implement the minimum skill level requirements and mandatory assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up programs recommended by this Commission. All three public segments shall proceed with the development of the intersegmental transfer core curriculum.**

- **The California State University shall maintain its lower-division enrollment at or below 40 percent of its undergraduate enrollment systemwide, and its planning documents shall reflect this policy.**

- **Beginning in the academic year 1989-90, the University of California shall reduce the percentage that lower-division enrollment systemwide is of total undergraduate enrollment by one percentage point each year through the academic year 1994-95. University enrollment planning documents, effective 1987-88, shall reflect this change and the goal of achieving a lower-division enrollment, systemwide, of no more than 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment by 1995-96 and maintaining that level thereafter.**

The right of qualified students to progress from a Community College to a baccalaureate-level institution is fundamental to the objectives of the state's postsecondary education system, There must be no needless impediments to progress if this right is to have meaning and if the transfer programs of the Community Colleges are to be attractive to high school graduates regardless of their original eligibility for admission to the California State University or the University of California.

Early in their school years, all students (and their parents) must know that if they prepare themselves they are entitled to a place in public postsecondary education. There should be an aggressive outreach program to identify and encourage Californians, in particular underrepresented minorities and students whose family members have never been to college, to attend a postsecondary institution. Those who enroll in a Community College must know that if they prepare themselves by successfully completing the transfer curriculum they can progress to the upper-division levels in a four-year university and, where capacity permits, at the public campus of their choice. An effective transfer system is essential to meeting the needs of California's highly diverse population. Absent an effective transfer system, there will be neither unity nor equity. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

4. The transfer function shall be recognized by the Governor, Legislature, and governing boards as a central institutional priority of all three public segments of postsecondary education:

- **The state shall guarantee by statute a place in postsecondary education for all qualified California students who wish to attend. Students who are eligible to enter the University of California or the California State University directly out of high school, but who attend a Community College, and all others who succeed in the transfer curriculum at the Community College level, shall be guaranteed future enrollment as upper-division students at the University of California or the California State University. The grade point average required of all such transfer students shall be the same within each segment regardless of their original eligibility, and all such transfer students shall be treated equally with continuing students for admission to the programs of their choice.**

- **Students who are eligible for admission to the University of California or to the California State University as first-time freshmen, but who elect to attend a Community College and who complete the required number of units, including the intersegmentally developed transfer core curriculum, with the requisite grade point average, shall be admitted to the**

University of California campus or to the California State University campus of their choice, depending upon their original eligibility, subject to the planned enrollment composition and growth for each campus.

- **The University of California and the California State University shall require students who are not regularly eligible for admission as freshmen (other than those admitted under special provisions) to complete the intersegmentally developed transfer core curriculum at a Community College. Those who complete the required courses with the requisite grade point average shall then be assured access to the California State University system or the University of California system as transfer students with full degree credit for that coursework.**

- **The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall have the authority and responsibility to guarantee that all Community College students have access to courses that meet the lower-division baccalaureate degree requirements of California public universities. The Board, with the cooperation of the University of California Regents and the California State University Trustees, shall make sure that students are clearly and fully informed as to which Community College courses and units are transferable and that requirements in the Community Colleges correspond to the requirements for, entry to, and success in, upper-division coursework.**

- **The governing boards of the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities and the State Board of Education shall be accountable for the implementation of formal systemwide articulation agreements and comparable course numbering systems within and among the segments as developed through the articulation mechanism to be established by the California Education Round Table.**

- **The Governor and Legislature shall provide the financial support necessary for the Community Colleges to offer comprehensive transfer programs and supporting services essential to an effective transfer function.**

The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall advise the Governor and Legislature annually as to the adequacy of state support in this regard and as to compliance with these

recommendations regarding both admissions and transfer on the part of all three public segments of postsecondary education.

The chairs of the governing boards of the California State University, the University of California, and the California Community College system shall present yearly reports to the Legislature on the status of transfer policies and rates and outstanding problems of intersegmental articulation and coordination.

Governance in a Unified System

The governing boards of public postsecondary institutions manage those institutions as public trusts. They derive their authority either directly from the people through the state constitution or indirectly through the Governor and Legislature by statute. Either way, they must be fully empowered to carry out their responsibilities or they are likely to be subject to frequent intervention by a variety of interests acting through the Governor and Legislature. The California State University and the University of California have strong governing structures that permit effective management at the segmental as well as the campus level. The University of California has been governed by the Board of Regents under Article IX of the California Constitution from its founding. The California State University is governed, as recommended in the 1960 Master Plan, by a statutorily created Board of Trustees, a body to which the Legislature has delegated full authority for the administration of all CSU campuses and programs. In practice, both boards delegate substantial authority to their chief executive officers and academic senates, and much of that authority is further delegated to the campuses.

The Community Colleges, on the other hand, have a weak central governing body that has not enjoyed the confidence of the Governor and the Legislature and that has, at best, unclear lines of authority with respect to the colleges. Moreover, the evolution of the colleges from predominately locally-supported to state-supported institutions has been accompanied by diminishing local responsibility and increasing legislative intervention in their management and administration. The state-level coordinating body, the Board of Governors, has not been delegated the clear authority necessary to establish and enforce policies on a statewide basis. Such authority is required to maintain a strong statewide system that can function effectively as a full partner with the University of California, the California State University, and the private institutions. That partnership is essential to the unified system.

If the Community Colleges are to carry out their responsibilities within the unified system, their governance structure must be strengthened substantially. In its earlier report on the California Community Colleges titled *The Challenge of Change,* this Commission recommended a number of measures to increase the authority and stature of the Board of Governors, to strengthen the district governing boards, and to

enhance the roles of faculty senates and student organizations in campus administration. These measures are necessary but not sufffcient.

After detailed study and lengthy debate, the Commission has determined that the Board of Governors must be delegated primary responsibility with respect to academic and financial administration of the colleges and that a direct relationship between the Board of Governors and the districts is necessary. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **5. The Governor and Legislature shall create the California Community College system to be administered as a unified state-local system by the Board of Governors with broad policy-making and management responsibilities in both academic and financial matters. The Community Colleges shall be acknowledged to be postsecondary institutions and not part of the public school system.**[8]

The proposed system provides for a unified state-local system that gives the Board of Governors primary authority and responsibility with respect to academic and financial management. While the Board undoubtedly will delegate many of the responsibilities already assumed by the local district boards, the districts will now be directly accountable to the Board for the implementation of statewide policy. The new system provides for specific acknowledgement of the Community Colleges as postsecondary institutions, removed from constraints associated with public school governance.

The proposed system will greatly reduce the incentive for individual district officials to approach the Legislature on their own. There will be one voice for the Community Colleges in terms of statewide policy and appropriations, and the Legislature will be less actively involved in trying to resolve individual problems raised by special interest groups. The Community College system will be able to speak with one authoritative voice as it develops an equal partnership with the other public and private postsecondary segments.

Faculty and Student Participation in Governance

College and university faculties have a major role to play through their established faculty senates in the academic administration of their campuses and segments. It is appropriate that they be delegated by the governing board appropriate responsibility with respect to such matters as establishing and enforcing academic standards, developing the curriculum, the policies for hiring, evaluation, and retention of faculty colleagues, and other academic matters. That is already the practice at the University of California; it is less true at the California State University and only

[8] For further details, see Appendix A, item 3.

marginally true in the California Community Colleges. There is an Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, and if it is to play its part in a unified system all academic senates must be able to work as peers with their colleagues.

The students must also be assured an opportunity to participate alongside the faculty and administrators in those aspects of campus and segmental administration that influence the achievements of their educational goals. Statewide student organizations also need to cooperate with each other and draw on institutionally based, effective student organizations.

The institutions will be strengthened through such delegation of authority by the governing boards as long as ultimate responsibility and accountability remains, as it must, with the governing boards. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **6. All three governing boards shall delegate appropriate authority to faculty senates with respect to academic standards; curriculum; policies for hiring, evaluation, and retention of faculty; and other academic matters. Students in all three public segments shall participate in appropriate aspects of campus and segmental governance. Regardless of the extent to which they delegate authority to administrators and the faculties, however, the governing boards shall be accountable for achieving and maintaining equity, quality, and efficiency in the operation of their institutions.**

II. Toward Greater Equity

California's greatest asset is its diverse population. Such diversity is a blessing. It will fuel continuing growth in the state's economy, its cultural life, its opportunities. But it will do so only if all citizens of the state have a full opportunity to share in that growth. Assuring educational equity is key to meeting this challenge.

Educational equity goes beyond the legal guarantee of access to education. It is an environment of fairness and responsiveness necessary for each person to fully reach his or her educational potential. We will not succeed as a society unless there is a commitment by the state and our educational institutions to equip all people to fully participate in and contribute to the growth of our social institutions. An equitable society is stronger because it draws on the talents of all its citizens.

A Guarantee of Equity

Educational equity is not new to California. It has long been a major priority in educational policy, and a number of important programs and activities have been established to achieve educational equity. Yet with few exceptions these programs and activities have not yielded satisfactory results. Success in postsecondary education -- and in the public schools -- continues to elude large numbers of Californians, who as a consequence are unable to participate fully in the economic growth of their communities.

With this experience, there are two choices. We can give up the effort, or, learning from our mistakes, we can make our commitment more profound. The Commission believes that California can and must choose the second course.

The most important lesson to be learned from past failures is that programs to achieve equity cannot be treated as the responsibility of just another group or office. Institutional barriers such as faculty and administrator attitudes, differential treatment, discriminatory curricula, and indifference must be addressed. Equity must be incorporated into every function of every educational institution, and leadership must come from the governing boards and from the California Education Round Table, which was originally formed for this purpose. Moreover, efforts to achieve equity must be fully funded by the state and appropriate positive financial incentives provided. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> 7. **Educational equity must have the commitment of the Governor, Legislature, the segmental governing boards, and the California Education Round Table and be a principal element in every aspect of institutional operations:**

- **The governing boards must exercise continuing oversight of their institutions' effectiveness in achieving educational equity. They must hold faculty and administrators accountable for the success of each institution in achieving equity, and themselves accept accountability to the people of the state. They must regularly assess and evaluate institutional progress toward equity, requesting reports by campus that rate (1) diversification of the undergraduate and graduate student bodies,** (2*)* **retention rates, with emphasis on underrepresented and special-action students, (3) faculty diversification, and (4) outreach efforts. They shall regularly report to the Governor and Legislature on progress made toward achieving educational equity.**

- **The Governor and Legislature should develop and fund positive performance driven incentives to encourage improvement in each of the four areas listed above and require regular reports from the segmental governing boards on their progress in achieving educational equity.**

The achievement of educational equity requires the presence of increased numbers of minorities and women on the campuses as students, faculty, and staff. To substantially raise the admission and retention rates for underrepresented minorities, we must significantly increase the number of minority faculty mentors on the campuses. Very small numbers of underrepresented minorities are now in the "academic pipeline," and national competition for their recruitment will be intense. Women are underrepresented at the graduate level outside of the traditionally female fields of English Literature and Education. There will be no change in the composition of the CSU and UC faculties or student bodies in the absence of a concerted effort to attract larger numbers of women and underrepresented minorities into the pipeline -- now.

The Commission believes the state must increase financial aid for graduate students. The state funds approximately 870 awards under its Graduate Fellowship program. The doubling of this effort, coupled with affirmative action recruitment programs, will produce a significant increase in the number of minority and female doctoral candidates. In the meantime, early appointment of new faculty in anticipation of vacancies, and additional support for research and teaching are among the immediate steps necessary to ensure that the state can effectively compete in the market for the most highly qualified faculty and can encourage academic careers among underrepresented populations. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

8. The Governor and Legislature shall support responsible governing board plans to enhance the quality, diversity, supply, and recruitment of candidates for faculty and administrative positions:

- **The Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall establish and the Governor and Legislature fund a statewide program for the early identification, recruitment, and training of minority and women undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate students for faculty and academic administrative positions. Additionally, the Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University shall establish and maintain a program for articulation between CSU undergraduate and master's programs and UC doctoral and professional programs for the purpose of recruiting underrepresented minorities and women to advanced study.[9] The independent institutions should be encouraged to participate in all of these endeavors.**

- **The Governor and Legislature shall increase support for graduate student financial aid for all programs, with the particular objective of increasing the number of female and underrepresented minority students in the public and independent universities who are preparing to become college and university teachers.**

The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall submit to the Legislature an annual report on the status of faculty and staff diversification in the public institutions. The report shall include information by campus and, where necessary, by department. Particular attention shall be given to those programs that evidence special success or failure in recruiting and retaining women and underrepresented minority faculty.

A Guarantee of Financial Assistance

For many potential students, the guarantee of a place in postsecondary education (as stated in Chapter I) is insufficient to convince them and their parents that postsecondary education is a reasonable aspiration. Low-income parents often see

[9] CSU has institutions with large numbers of underrepresentcd minorities who do not see a natural progression to the doctoral level at UC campuses.

little hope of saving the funds necessary to allow their sons or daughters to attend college, even a relatively low-cost community college, or of doing without the income a son or daughter in school might otherwise provide. Knowledge of guaranteed future financial assistance, however, can be a powerful incentive for high school students to pursue rigorous programs in preparation for college study and for their parents to give them the necessary encouragement and support.

State support for undergraduate student financial aid has risen greatly since 1960, but it has not always kept pace with undergraduate enrollment growth in the public and private institutions. Moreover, the maximum award amount under the Cal Grant program has been permitted to lag well behind increases in the cost of attending independent colleges and universities. As a consequence, many students who might have attended an independent institution, at substantially less cost to the taxpayers, have been unable to do so. The maximum award amount should be increased to equal the average of the operating cost per student at UC and at CSU. As long as the maximum award amount is at the combined average operating cost per student for UC and CSU, the state will be assured that students may make full use of the independent institutions without those institutions determining the cost of state aid.

It is also important that state-funded student aid be "portable" -- that it be awarded to the student rather than to the institution. When student aid is available only to students enrolled in a public institution, the cost difference between public and independent institutions is increased and student choice is diminished.

Over the past dozen years, there has been a dramatic change in the form in which financial aid is provided to California students. Loans have risen from 25 percent to 50 percent of the total, while grants have declined from 65 percent to 43 percent (the balance being student employment). As a consequence, indebtedness among students, former students, and their parents has also risen rapidly.

The growth of student loans has enabled many students to enroll in postsecondary institutions, and in California the bulk of grant aid continues to go to financially needy students. Nevertheless, the Commission believes that loans should not be allowed to be the primary form of student aid and that there should be increased state support for student employment and grants. Moreover, the Commission strongly favors the development of opportunities for graduates to repay their student loans through public service employment. *Therefore the Commission recommends that:*

9. The Governor and Legislature shall guarantee student financial aid in a manner which optimizes student choice:

- **The Governor and Legislature shall guarantee by statute that all needy students who perform well, as evidenced by being regularly admissible to the University of California or the California State University, will be provided adequate**

financial support to attend an accredited California institution of their choice, based on uniform estimates of need.

- **The Governor and Legislature shall adjust support for undergraduate student financial aid so that the number of awards keeps pace with enrollment growth. The maximum award amount shall be raised and maintained at the equivalent of the average full operating cost per student for the California State University and the University of California.**

- **The Governor and Legislature shall seek to fund approximate equality in grant and loan aid to stem the problem of overreliance on loans. In addition, state support for student employment both on campus and off campus shall be provided to supplement grants and loans, and loan recipients shall have an opportunity to repay their loans through public service employment following completion of their studies.**

The California Student Aid Commission shall regularly report to the Governor and Legislature on the effectiveness of these recommendations in accomplishing state policy.

A Guarantee of Equity for Older, Part-Time Students

There are implicit assumptions throughout the 1960 Master Plan that college students would continue to be ethnically homogenous, well-prepared, recent high school graduates who would attend college on a full-time basis. The organization of California's four-year universities continues to reflect these assumptions (with important exceptions at some CSU campuses), but with the urbanization of the state and its rapidly changing demographics, student characteristics have begun to change significantly: the average age of the graduating college senior is beyond 24, and the average age of the Community College student is 30; an increasing number of students need to work; many former students are "retooling," coming back to Community Colleges or to four-year colleges for new skills or a second B.A.; there are more reentry students, particularly women, returning to college to finish degrees; and more students need to make up course deficiencies or take noncredit remedial offerings and thus take longer to complete a degree.

The Commission has emphasized the centrality of the transfer function to the successful operation of the educational system. Yet one of the clearest barriers to student progression is the "full-time" nature of education at the University of California and, to a lesser degree, the California State University. Some 70 percent of Community College students are employed at least thirty-five hours per week, but it is very difficult to combine full-time employment and study at the University of California. The California State University system does somewhat better, but

students who must work full-time during the day may find it difficult to take the classes they need to graduate.

The trend toward the older, part-time student who works and has a family is clear. The Community Colleges have been responsive, but the need to adapt university programs to accommodate those students who wish to pursue a baccalaureate degree is apparent. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **10. The California State University shall have responsibility for meeting the needs of older, part-time students who desire to pursue the baccalaureate degree. The University of California, however, shall seek to accommodate those students whose aspirations lead them to that institution. The role and mission statements of both segments must contain a specific commitment to integrating such students who are eligible to matriculate into academic degree programs. The Regents and the Trustees shall make whatever specific organizational changes are necessary to carry out that commitment, and shall review and where necessary adapt admissions standards for older students to account for the skills and experience that are a better measure of potential success than are out-of-date high school records.**
>
> **The Governor and Legislature shall further express the state's commitment to equity for older, part-time students by funding at the University of California and the California State University all courses and programs leading to degrees for matriculated students, whether on campus or off campus.**

A *Guarantee of the Chance to Succeed*

Retention has become a major issue for the universities, both in terms of educational equity and in preparing citizens of the state for future economic changes. If California is to respond to the challenges of the emerging "high-tech" and service-oriented economy, then increasing numbers of its citizens must be educated to at least the baccalaureate level.

California currently ranks second nationally in percentage of adult citizens with at least four years of college, but this is true in part because it attracts so many college graduates from other states and nations. Graduation rates for the California State University are much lower than for similar institutions. Graduation rates among Black, Hispanic, and American Indian, and certain other underrepresented groups are low in both the California State University and the University of California.

A variety of factors contribute to retention rates, and some are beyond the influence of the institutions. However, there are both ethical and economic implications to relatively low rates, and these must be addressed by the system. Students, of course,

bear some responsibility for their own success, but the educational institutions must share responsibility for the students they admit, including students who are admitted as exceptions to regular admission criteria. Both the University of California and the California State University have especially low retention rates for special-action students. These rates must be improved substantially. Many of the methods by which this objective can be attained -- mandatory assessment and counseling, greater student-faculty interaction, tutorial assistance, or other means -- may be chosen by each governing board according to the needs of its students at each campus.

Remediation, however, is essential to retention. The authors of the 1960 Master Plan thought the Community Colleges would "relieve" the four-year institutions "of the burden of doing remedial work." This has not proved true. Remediation has been necessary in the four-year institutions not only for those admitted as exceptions to the regular admission requirements but also for large numbers of regularly admitted students. Many otherwise qualified students are inadequately prepared in English or mathematics, or both.

In addition, the English speaking ability of recent immigrants, regardless of their educational background, often must be improved before they can pursue a college degree. Developing English as a Second Language (ESL) for immigrants new to California is critical to the state's future success. At present, ESL programs are generally uncoordinated and vary greatly in their design and implementation. More information is necessary to assure the development of the most effective ESL programs.

The principal solution to these problems is to improve preparation in the public schools, but that will take time. In the meantime, remedial instruction and instruction in English as a Second Language will be necessary in the four-year institutions to guarantee that otherwise qualified students, once admitted, have an opportunity to succeed.[10] Remedial education is not, however, a primary role. It must be held to a minimum and it must not be credited toward fulfilling baccalaureate degree requirements. The limitations will prevent remediation from overtaking and supplanting the more fundamental instructional functions of each segment. Successful remediation requires careful monitoring of student development and progress. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **11. The governing boards of the three public segments must be held accountable for the retention rates among students admitted to their institutions. The Board of Trustees of the California State University and the Regents of the University of California shall seek to achieve and maintain systemwide graduation rates that are at least equal to or above the national averages for similar**

[10] See Appendix A, item 5, for a taxonomy of remedial instruction.

institutions with comparable admission requirements. By 1995, the University of California and the California State University should improve their retention rates of special-action admittees to at least two-thirds of those of the regularly admitted student body.

The segments may offer remedial courses, but only if such courses are based on careful student assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up to improve the retention and success of underprepared students -- particularly those admitted by special action. The California Community Colleges shall limit the number of units of remedial coursework a student may take -- with exemptions or waivers possible in certain cases -- directing students needing additional work to the adult basic education programs. The University of California and the California State University shall establish and maintain clearly defined academic floors below which they shall not offer remedial courses and they shall eventually phase-out remedial instruction, other than that required for reentry students, as preparation of students by the public schools improves. Remedial courses shall be state-funded and shall carry workload credit, but may not be credited toward the baccalaureate.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall establish a Task Force on English as a Second Language to study, evaluate, and make recommendations to the segments regarding the development of effective ESL programs, and the three public segments shall assure the effective articulation, coordination, and quality of English as a Second Language programs.[11]

[11] See Appendix B, item 2 for further details.

III. Toward Enhancing Educational Quality

Without quality, the objectives of unity, equity, and efficiency are of little consequence. The state and its educational institutions must share a commitment to educational quality.

Quality in the Public Schools

Serious criticism has been leveled at the nation's public schools. In response, many reforms and initiatives have been put in place to improve their quality. The state's goal for the public schools is to graduate educated young men and women of all backgrounds who have the skills and knowledge to continue on the academic or occupational path of their choice and contribute to society. To do so requires particular attention to high risk students and a sharp reduction in the dropout rate. When that ideal is realized, the educational continuum will be strengthened to the benefit of the students, the system, and the state. Postsecondary education must contribute its expertise and resources to this high state priority.

The recruitment and training of greater numbers of talented, committed future public school teachers of all backgrounds continues to be a pressing need. Research into methods of teaching and learning are fundamental to greater success in the public schools. The governing boards must impress upon their institutions that better education of teachers is essential to improvement in the public schools, and ultimately to the success of the universities themselves. The education of teachers is a crucial institutionwide responsibility and must be reflected through faculty commitments and priorities and through careful evaluation of prospective teachers prior to their entry into the classroom. Public school personnel must be more fully involved in all evaluative processes, not only of teachers but also in determination of the research agenda for public school improvement. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **12. The Trustees of the California State University, the Regents of the University of California, and the governing boards of accredited degree-granting independent colleges and universities shall make sure that the education of teachers is among the highest priorities for institutional and systemwide support.**
>
> **The Trustees of the California State University and the Regents of the University of California shall formally recognize professional service to the public schools as part of their faculties' responsibilities. Faculty who contribute in this role should be rewarded through the retention, promotion, and tenure process or by other appropriate means such as reduced teaching loads or released time for related research. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall establish a pilot program or**

explore other means to encourage an enhanced role for Community College faculty.

The Trustees of the California State University shall establish a system of consultation with the public schools so that public school teachers and administrators will have an opportunity to assist in determining the education research agenda of the California State University.

The teaching profession itself should bear a major responsibility for the improvement of teacher education. The California State University and the University of California shall require teacher candidates to participate in classroom programs in which each is jointly evaluated by a district teacher and a faculty member of the student's teacher training program. In addition, the state by statute shall require professional appraisal of individual teacher candidates -- as well as program approval of the institution -- prior to certification.

Quality in Undergraduate Instruction

Questions about quality are not unique to the public schools. California's postsecondary institutions have long enjoyed world renown for their exceptional quality, but in an era when specialized research is increasingly the primary measure of faculty quality, undergraduate teaching suffers.

General education has been neglected in the undergraduate curriculum. The purpose of undergraduate education is to prepare students to lead full, productive, and useful lives and the flexibility to adapt to changing economic and social conditions, new work-force needs, and demands of a multicultural society. General education must therefore help students to develop critical thinking, creativity, adaptability, and intellectual flexibility. The experience must draw not only on western historical and philosophical traditions, but also on the traditions of the broader world community and California's new citizens. It must provide the foundations of scientific theory and methods and the ideas, issues, and controversies of technology. Ultimately, it should create common cultural frames of reference that are civilizing influences on society as a whole. It should include language study and instruction in the thought and history of other cultures. And it should teach the value and importance of public service.

A strong general education program is at the core of undergraduate instruction. It must provide a coherence and breadth to the students studies that prepare them for productive lives while developing common values.

Especially at the lower-division level, however, the undergraduate curriculum is too often fragmented and incoherent. Effective teaching and learning depend in part on

the existence of a coherent rationale underlying the undergraduate curriculum. Faculty must know how the courses they teach serve the intellectual development of their students, and students need a fundamental understanding of why they study a particular subject within the larger whole. Campuses must establish clear curricular objectives, match curricular development to those objectives, and institutionalize systematic evaluation of program and individual curricular offerings. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **13. The governing boards, in consultation with the faculty, shall be responsible for the coherence and the quality of the undergraduate curriculum, and, consistent with statutory mission and role, they shall publish clear statements citing specific curricular goals, objectives, and priorities for the segments as a whole and for each of the campuses.**
>
> **Governing boards must be forceful and proactive in protecting and advancing general education within the undergraduate curriculum and shall carefully consider in consultation with the faculty the following actions: (1) creating a common general education core curriculum, or designing coherent breadth requirements with comprehensible goals and objectives; (2) requiring two full years of general education, or developing programs to ensure that general education is a continuing part of a student's education through the undergraduate years; (3) expanding international and multicultural education programs to enhance opportunities for developing understanding in these areas; (4) requiring competency in a second language for all college graduates both to meet the needs of a multilingual world and to have the opportunity to understand a different culture through its primary mode of expression; and (5) providing for voluntary public service for credit, when appropriate, to enhance opportunities for the development of civic responsibility.**

The quality of classroom instruction is crucial to the success of students, not simply as a means of conveying information, but because good teachers can motivate students to seek greater academic challenges and achievement. Faculty performance in the classroom must be a primary concern of the governing boards, administration, and faculty. Faculty excellence in teaching must be a high institutional priority. The principal mission of the California State University is instruction, and faculty should be evaluated accordingly. The principal missions of the University of California are instruction and research, and faculty should be evaluated on both these grounds. At both CSU and UC, however, there is evidence that teaching is not given appropriate priority. At some CSU campuses, research has become an increasingly important criterion for faculty promotion. At UC, although university policy theoretically gives equal weight to teaching and research, teaching has been subordinate to the research imperative. In certain cases, there

may be justification for emphasizing one over the other, but the general policy must be that teaching is weighed equally with research for UC faculty and given greater weight for CSU faculty. The governing boards must make sure that their policies to this end are enforced. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **14. The segmental governing boards must affirm that the oversight of teaching quality is as important a governance issue as their other management and administrative responsibilities. They must require regular reports from the campuses and the systemwide chief executive officers as to the state and quality of undergraduate instruction for each campus and for the segment as a whole. Such reports should have specific performance measures that make it possible to determine the quality of instruction in each of the colleges and universities.**
>
> **The Trustees of the California State University shall by policy declare and ensure that teaching is given the greatest weight among the factors considered in the retention, promotion, and tenure process. The Regents of the University of California shall by policy declare and ensure that teaching is in fact of equal weight to research in retention, promotion, and tenure. All three public segmental governing boards shall ensure that teaching is of major importance in post-tenure review.**

The governing boards of the University of California and California's independent colleges and universities should examine requirements for the doctoral degree and should insist on a restructuring of programs, where appropriate, toward greater emphasis on the development of teaching skills for those candidates about to enter the professoriate. Whether taught at public institutions in California, or elsewhere, all faculty should be trained to teach before entering the classroom. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **15. The governing boards shall ensure that all faculty and teaching assistants have the necessary instructional skills prior to entering a classroom. They shall provide incentives for teaching excellence not only through the retention, promotion, and tenure process but by other appropriate mechanisms as well. Direct faculty interaction with students through advising and other out-of-classroom contact are integral parts of the teaching function and should be encouraged and rewarded accordingly.**

The public colleges and universities must be free to employ both part-time and full-time faculty to fill specific needs and to make the best use of available resources. Part-time faculty have much to contribute and frequently bring special knowledge and background to the classroom. Some, however, are overextended and teach at multiple institutions with little time for out of classroom contact with students or other faculty responsibilities. The institutions must make sure that the teaching, counseling, and curricular responsibilities of part-time faculty are similar to those

for full-time faculty, both in and out of the classroom, and that part-time faculty are compensated accordingly. Part-time faculty are more frequently used in the Community Colleges to fill the need for additional faculty. Thus, the Board of Governors must make an extra effort to ensure that instructional quality does not suffer as a result. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **16. The segmental governing boards shall thoroughly evaluate policies regarding part-time faculty to ensure that all departmental and collegial responsibilities are met. Through periodic review, they shall make sure that the use of part-time faculty does not undermine instructional quality or become excessive and is reduced where it is already excessive.**
>
> **The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall develop pilot programs that offer faculty rolling contracts of two to five years in length as an alternative to multiple part-time appointments at several institutions, giving the college greater latitude in meeting staffing needs and permitting part-time faculty to better meet student needs. Tenured faculty members should not be discouraged from transferring between districts as need occurs, and the Board shall by policy ensure that tenure in one district can be regained in a new district in a relatively short period of time.**

Changing educational conditions dictate changes in the skills needed by college faculties. Faculty members must remain current in rapidly advancing fields if they are to adequately address student needs. They must have the time and support necessary to develop new pedagogical approaches in light of inadequacies in the lecture system, the need for closer student-faculty interaction, and the development of new instructional technologies. Many faculty members need further development in intercultural and interpersonal skills if they are to respond sensitively and effectively to much more heterogeneous student bodies and a variety of new student concerns. Thus, professional development is needed not only in the scholarly field, but also for professional renewal to meet changing circumstances. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **17. The Governor and Legislature, by providing adequate state financial support, and the governing boards, by policy, shall actively encourage and support faculty professional development.**

The burden of too many students per class and too many classes to teach often prevents faculty from giving careful attention to all their students, adequately preparing for classes, meeting public service and research obligations, and seeing to their own professional growth. All of these demands are exacerbated when student-faculty ratios are allowed to increase as they have in recent years. Rising student-faculty ratios are clearly detrimental to instructional quality. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

18. The Governor and Legislature shall stem the trend toward increased student-faculty ratios and shall carefully consider whether current student-faculty ratios are detrimental to quality instruction and should be reduced.

Quality in Vocational Education

Quality in vocational education has long been of state interest. As the pressures increase to provide a wide range of career training and skill improvement opportunities, the need to ensure quality becomes even more important. Previous efforts to determine the success and quality of vocational education have been handicapped, however, by the lack of a comprehensive data base on programs offered and students served by the public sector. Moreover, private postsecondary vocational schools now provide a large share of all vocational instruction and job training, but little is known about the scope of their programs or their effectiveness. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

19. The State Job Training Coordinating Council shall establish an integrated statewide system of planning, evaluation, and data collection for the use of all public and private institutions which offer vocational education and job training. The Council shall be responsible for the initial establishment of the system and in doing so shall consult with the Board of Governors, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the State Board of Education. All private occupational schools shall be required to participate in the state system of data collection as a condition of accreditation, licensing, or approval by the state.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission is responsible for seeing that information about labor market patterns, the training requirements of each occupation, licensing requirements, and existing program offerings are considered when decisions are made about establishing or maintaining vocational programs. At present, however, it lacks the staff to do so on a timely and comprehensive basis. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

20. The Governor and Legislature shall fund a strengthened program review office in the California Postsecondary Education Commission specifically to include the capacity to review vocational and occupational programs in the two-year and four-year institutions.

Quality in Graduate Instruction

Graduate education constitutes an important element of postsecondary education, one that will become increasingly significant in the next few decades. More and more students are likely to seek graduate degrees as part of their career preparation or advancement, and graduate study is likely to become a necessity for advancement in an increasing number of occupations.

California is blessed with outstanding graduate programs -- particularly in the public sector, but also among several of the state's independent institutions. Those graduate programs successfully compete in national and international arenas with enormous benefit to California in terms of its financial and human resources.

To maintain our preeminence in graduate education we must be certain that competing pressures do not diminish program quality. The state must be prepared to make the essential budgetary commitment to support continuing authorized growth of graduate education, but limited resources must be effectively allocated to areas that are responsive to societal needs as well as to state priorities and concerns. This will require periodic review of existing as well as proposed new programs.

Special attention must be given to master's degree programs. In recent years, the meaning and purpose of the master's degree has become increasingly confused. In some cases it is clearly a terminal degree necessary for certification and advancement in a profession. In other fields, however, master's programs often end up competing directly with parallel undergraduate programs (e.g., in certain cases between the M.B.A. and undergraduate business degrees, or the master's in social work and B.S.W. programs). In many liberal arts and sciences fields, the degree has become merely a consolation prize for persons who stop short of the doctorate. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **21. The Regents of the University of California and the Trustees of the California State University shall maintain consistent policies for rigorous and systematic review of the quality of graduate programs. In addition to quality evaluations, reviews must determine whether there is a continuing need and adequate resources for both existing and new programs; programs for which both conditions do not exist shall be phased out. CPEC shall advise the segments, the Governor, and the Legislature on segmental compliance with this policy.**
>
> The California Postsecondary Education Commission seek private foundation or state support for a blue ribbon commission to study the master's degree in the California State University, the University of California, and the independent institutions.

Based upon the result of such reviews, students applying for admission to doctoral programs should be given specific information about the ratio of applications to acceptance for the previous years, placement experience of earlier graduates, sources of student aid for students currently enrolled, levels of indebtedness for those completing the degree in the previous five years, ethnic and gender distribution of program students, and length of time to complete the degree.

Quality in the New Instructional Technologies

New instructional technologies have the exciting potential for revolutionizing the educational process. Improving the quality of learning through the application of these rapidly changing and advancing technologies is a serious issue. It requires careful monitoring and evaluation for impact on students and their development of critical cognitive skills, particularly in the public schools where the application of technology to instruction is already quite extensive.

Systemwide policies endorsed by institutional governing boards and supported by the central administration, faculty, and students, are essential to the successful application and integration of the new instructional technologies. Such policy endorsement will enable the institutions to employ these technologies on a scale that will enhance the delivery of information and instruction and provide for interconnected networks allowing free movement of information between campuses, sharing of resources, elimination of unnecessary duplication, and support of instructional activities both on and off campus.

Among the public segments, the California State University produces the majority of teachers in California and thus has a major responsibility for assuring that the most up-to-date means of enhancing instruction, while maintaining quality, are utilized by faculty within the colleges and universities and within the schools of education. The California State University has an excellent history of technological integration and implementation and an extensive systemwide network already in place. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **22. The governing boards of the California State University, the University of California, and the California Community Colleges shall establish appropriate infrastructures in their systems and on their campuses so that the new instructional technologies are effectively integrated in support of the fundamental institutional missions.**

The California State University shall have a particular responsibility for and shall receive state support to research and evaluate the impact new instructional technologies have on the learning process. CSU shall work in close consultation with the University of California, the California Community Colleges, the State Department of Education, and representatives of the independent institutions through the California Education Round Table.

Accreditation

Regional, national, and specialized accreditation are the principal guarantees of overall institutional quality in American higher education. Through this voluntary system, institutional quality is subject to peer review organized and administered by practicing educators. This system has avoided the creation of ministries of education of the sort that have so bureaucratized and politicized the educational systems of many other countries.

Voluntary accreditation, however, has problems. Regional accrediting agencies, which accredit the whole institution, are criticized for evaluating quality in terms of inputs or resources (library holdings, student-faculty ratios, facilities, percentage of faculty holding the doctorate), rather than in terms of what happens to the students. Specialized accrediting agencies, which accredit particular programs such as engineering or business, often insist on so many discipline-specific requirements that the students' general education suffers. Because of the large stake the state has in ensuring postsecondary quality, the representatives of California's public and private institutions who serve on the accrediting boards must be held responsible for the implementation of necessary improvements in the accreditation process. *Therefore, the Commission recommends:*

23. To assure quality and breadth in the undergraduate curriculum, the chief executive officers and other representatives of the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, and California's accredited private institutions must exert their influence as board members of various accrediting agencies to insure that:

(a) the regional accrediting commissions take sufficient cognizance of student "outcomes" in evaluating institutions -- holding colleges and universities accountable for clear expectations for student learning and appropriate assessment programs to determine whether the expectations are being met; and

(b) the programmatic accrediting agencies acknowledge the larger institutional missions and purposes of undergraduate colleges and the importance of maintaining the integrity of the general education curriculum guarding against over specialization and excessive requirements for academic majors.

Many institutions, however, are unaccredited and are instead licensed by the state. The Commission is concerned that current licensing procedures may not provide adequate protection for students and assist individual schools in maintaining quality. For these schools, the state should strengthen and maintain policies for regular and careful review of all licensing procedures, and it should limit the operation of unaccredited institutions to those that demonstrate through the licensing process that they offer quality programs.[12]

[12] See Appendix B, item 3 for details of a legislatively mandated study.

IV. Toward More Efficient Use of Educational Resources

If instructional quality and responsiveness to diversity are to be ensured in the future, California must be certain that it is now making effective and efficient use of all of its postsecondary education resources, public and private. In an era of rapidly rising costs for other public services and growing constraints on state revenues, efficiency in the operation of the public institutions is essential if there is to be adequate funding for further growth. Although enrollment is increasing relatively slowly now, very substantial growth is projected for the 1990's.

Greater attention must also be given to potential methods of containing operating and capital costs, establishing and maintaining efficient pricing policies, and employing equitable funding formulas that reflect institutional missions. Long-range planning, coordinated by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, must become a central element in the management of each segment.

Long-Range Planning and Cost Containment

Postsecondary education, which now receives approximately 16 percent of state General Fund revenues, must compete with the public schools, health care, corrections, and other major state-supported services for additional funding. Therefore, every effort must be made to assure taxpayers that funds for postsecondary education are being used as efficiently as possible. Long-range planning and cost containment are the responsibility of each segment and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Continuing, systematic long-range planning is essential to the efficient and orderly growth of postsecondary education in California. Long-range planning must take into account such matters as projected enrollment growth, undergraduate and graduate academic plans, faculty supply and demand, educational equity, facility and space standards, potential uses of new technology, funding sources, the need for student services, and the impact of one segment's decisions on the academic and financial health of the others. Such planning also must be based upon certain common assumptions, including assumptions about enrollment growth or decline in both the public and the private sectors.

In the absence of systematic and comprehensive long-range planning, important public policy decisions are often made on an *ad hoc* basis and before many are aware that they have been made. Examples of this are common in the selection of new campus sites, the patterns of growth in undergraduate enrollment, the allocation of student financial aid, the development of new instructional programs, and many other ways.

Central to effective long-range planning is the development of comprehensive long-range enrollment projections. The Department of Finance is the appropriate agency to prepare the projections for the public institutions on which current support and capital outlay budgets are based. CPEC, working with the Department of Finance and the segments, must take responsibility for extending those projections to encompass all of postsecondary education and to take into account the full array of factors that are likely to affect enrollments in this state. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **24. The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall have the following responsibilities with regard to long-range planning in consultation with the segments: (1) development of a common definition of long-range planning; (2) development of a common set of assumptions upon which such planning is to be based; (3) review of segmental activities to verify that they periodically prepare and update long-range plans based upon the common set of assumptions; and (4) annual preparation of detailed 20-year projections of postsecondary enrollment in the public and private sectors at all levels of instruction, built upon the projections prepared by the Department of Finance.**

Each segment will continue to be responsible for developing its own long-range academic and facility plans, but such plans will be related to the development of postsecondary education generally and not simply to the aspirations of each segment. Moreover, CPEC will be informed of such planning as it takes place, rather than after the fact as at present.

It is also extremely important that any proposed expansion of existing campuses or development of new campuses and off-campus centers be justified according to the mission of each segment. Community College campuses should be expanded or new colleges built as necessary for growth in lower-division and occupational programs, but not for increases in noncredit and community service courses.[13] CSU campuses should be expanded or new campuses built to serve growth in undergraduate and graduate enrollment through the master's degree. UC campuses should be expanded to serve authorized growth at the graduate level plus related undergraduate enrollment. Neither should be expanded principally to accommodate growth at the lower-division level. An increase in the number of high school graduates going on to college is not-sufficient justification for building new research or teaching university campuses. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **25. In reviewing the proposed growth of existing campuses and the development of new campuses and off-campus centers, the segmental governing boards and the California Postsecondary Education Commission shall verify that the proposed growth is**

[13] See Appendix B, item 1 for further discussion noncredit instruction.

appropriate to the mission of each segment. The Community Colleges shall be expanded as necessary to accommodate growth in demand for lower-division academic and vocational instruction for credit; the California State University shall be expanded as necessary to accommodate growth in demand for upper-division instruction and instruction through the master's degree and the accompanying lower-division enrollment; the University of California shall be expanded as necessary to accommodate approved growth in graduate and postgraduate instruction and the accompanying undergraduate enrollment.

Many of the statutory responsibilities of CPEC pertain to cost containment and the maintenance of efficiency in postsecondary education expenditures. CPEC is also authorized to gather information from the private institutions which it may use to determine whether there is excess capacity in those institutions that may be used to accommodate projected enrollment growth. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

26. The California Postsecondary Education Commission, in cooperation with the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst, and in consultation with the segments, shall regularly review methods of controlling state-supported costs of postsecondary education and for the elimination of waste and unnecessary duplication. These reviews shall include a careful examination of ways in which unused capacity among private institutions may be employed to accommodate enrollment growth at the undergraduate and graduate levels and thus reduce costs to the state's taxpayers.

California has long been a leader in the use of workload measures (formulas) as a basis for determining the annual state appropriations for support of postsecondary education. These formulas have the merit of being relatively objective and predictable in their application. In time, however, budget formulas may provide unexpected spending incentives or may produce differing levels of institutional support that cannot be justified by differences in mission.

For these reasons, the state's budget formulas must be reexamined periodically to make certain that they do not have unintended and undesirable results. Inasmuch as CPEC also is directed by statute to establish (in consultation with the segments, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst), criteria for state support for new and existing postsecondary programs, it is the appropriate agency to undertake such studies. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

27. The California Postsecondary Education Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, and the three public segments of postsecondary education, shall regularly examine the formulas used to budget

state support for each of the public segments. The objective of these studies shall be to make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature about ways to eliminate incentives for excessive spending, eliminate differences in funding formulas that are not justified by differences in role and mission, and maintain an equitable allocation of state support among the three segments. These studies should also include determination of costs by level of instruction for all three public segments.[14]

Budgeting State Support for the California Community Colleges

Current funding for the Community Colleges is determined according to statutory formulas in the Education Code, much like current funding for the public schools. There is no budget development process from the campuses up through the Board of Governors comparable to that of the University of California and the California State University. The Board of Governors plays little part in the budget process except when a change in the statutory formula is proposed, and then it is but one among many Community College organizations seeking to influence the Legislature's decisions as it considers proposed amendments to the funding statutes.

This serves to weaken the Board of Governors and deny the Community Colleges a strong, unified voice in the state's annual budget deliberations. It also tends to exclude the Community Colleges from other funding decisions for postsecondary education. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

28. The California Community Colleges shall be funded by the state through the annual budget act according to standards and workload measures appropriate to their status as postsecondary institutions. The Board of Governors shall be authorized by statute to allocate state support among the districts and colleges according to rules and regulations to be established by the Board. Funding for Community College capital outlay projects shall be provided by the state in the same manner as is employed for the University of California and the California State University.

At present, Community College enrollment growth in credit classes and in state-supported noncredit classes is funded only to the extent that it does not exceed growth in the adult population. This "cap" was imposed some years ago when sudden and unanticipated growth in a single year threatened the state's ability to fund other public services. A ceiling on growth in noncredit instruction, which is subject to a large degree of administrative control, may be necessary, but the ceiling on credit enrollment is not justified in the Commission's view. At times, Community

[14] See Appendix A, item 4, for further details.

College credit enrollment can and should grow more rapidly than the total adult population, and imposition of an arbitrary ceiling only reduces the level of support for the most rapidly growing colleges. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **29. The statutory provision limiting the annual increase in state support for the Community Colleges to the percentage growth in the state's adult population shall be repealed by the Legislature, but the Board of Governors shall be responsible for guarding against sudden unanticipated increases in enrollment that strain state funding resources.**

Pricing Public Postsecondary Education

Recent legislation has established that in California the state is primarily responsible for the cost of providing postsecondary education, but that students in all three public segments should bear a portion of the total cost of their education. It has also established that fees should be low and any changes in fees should be gradual, moderate, and predictable.

The Commission strongly supports this policy. Low student fees are a strong tradition in this state. In prior years when state funding was constrained by a decrease in revenues or by particularly intense competition for the funds available, the four-year segments, especially, tended to rely on adjustments in student fees to help fill the shortfall. The result was unpredictable increases in student fees, which placed unprecedented burdens on currently enrolled students and discouraged potential students from attending.

The Board of Governors should have much the same authority with respect to the determination of student charges as the Trustees of the California State University. The exercise of such authority would be consistent with other Commission recommendations regarding the Board of Governors' fiscal duties and responsibilities. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **30. The state shall continue to be primarily responsible for funding postsecondary education, and students shall continue to pay a portion of the cost; but student charges shall not be changed substantially in any single year. Fees shall be maintained by the state and governing boards in a constant relationship to state support within each segment, and fee increases that do occur shall be waived or offset by financial aid for needy students.**
>
> **The Board of Governors shall be given statutory responsibility for establishing Community College charges.**

If graduate studies are substantially more costly than undergraduate studies, student charges may very well reflect that difference. At the same time, however, the governing boards shall not establish fees in a manner that will unduly influence student choices as to the courses and programs in which they enroll or needlessly discourage full-time enrollment. Moreover, if student charges are differentiated according to level or program, it shall be the responsibility of the governing board to support such differentiations with appropriate cost data. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **31. The segmental governing boards shall have authority to differentiate between undergraduate and graduate levels and between professional programs at the graduate level in establishing student charges. Segmental governing boards shall have the authority to set fees in relation to costs in a manner that will not unduly influence student program decisions.**

Nonresident students in all three public segments should be expected to pay the full (average) cost of their instruction. California benefits substantially from the influx of large numbers of students from other states and nations, many of whom become permanent residents. Until such students do become residents, however, it is appropriate that they and their families, rather than the California taxpayers, pay for the cost of their instruction. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **32. Nonresident tuition for all three public segments shall be equal to the average cost of instruction and related services, including administration but excluding research, except that it shall not exceed the average charge at comparable institutions in other states.**

Student Financial Aid Policy

When the 1960 Master Plan was written, student financial aid was uncomplicated and very limited, and student aid policy formulation could remain with the Governor, the Legislature, and the segments. In the intervening years, student financial aid has become a very complex matter of substantial importance to many students and to every postsecondary institution, public and private. Decisions as to which students are to receive aid, in what amounts, in what forms, at what institutions, and for what studies are now major factors in determining not only access to postsecondary education but the structure of the postsecondary enterprise itself.

In the absence of a body that is responsible for student aid policy, however, a number of important issues have not received the systematic consideration they merit. These issues include the declining share of state grants going to students at independent colleges and universities, the increase in institutional (nonportable) aid at public institutions, changes in student aid necessary to meet the needs of a more diverse student population, the appropriateness of funding student aid from student

fees, the efficacy of student aid as a manpower development device, and other matters.

California also needs a unified and authoritative voice in Washington D.C. to respond to proposed changes in federal policy, express the state's views (rather than those of the individual institutions), and help in other ways to shape federal policy so that it is of maximum benefit to California's students. At present, there is no state agency capable of doing this.

If the state is to gain the ability to formulate a coherent, effective student aid policy, it is logical that responsibility for doing so should be assigned to the Student Aid Commission, the agency that now has primary responsibility for administering state student financial aid. The commission's policy responsibility should encompass not only those programs that it administers, but state-supported student financial aid in all its forms, including the grants, loans, waivers, and work-study programs administered by the segments. *Therefore, the Commission recommends that:*

> **33. The Student Aid Commission shall, by statute, have primary responsibility for formulating state financial aid policy and shall administer all state-funded student financial aid programs other than those administered by the institutions.**

Accompanying this change in the commission's responsibilities should be a change in its membership. The Student Aid Commission is now composed of 15 members, of which 7 are public members and 8 (including two students) are representatives of the public and private segments and the public schools. As the commission takes on responsibility for state policy formulation for student financial aid, its membership should be expanded to include a majority of public members.

V. Resources and Responsibility

If unity, equity, quality, and efficiency are to be achieved, the Governor, the Legislature, and the people of California must provide the required financial resources. They, we, must provide the resources necessary to support the continuing quality and efficiency of operation we expect of our postsecondary institutions. Our expectations of our colleges and universities, in short, must be matched by our willingness to meet their costs.

Education at all levels now receives about 55 percent of the State's General Fund expenditures and postsecondary education about 16 percent. As recommended reforms are carried out in the elementary and secondary schools and enrollment at all levels continues to rise more rapidly than the state's population, there is little likelihood that these percentages will decline. On the contrary, there will be strong pressures to raise them,

In this study, therefore, the Commission has given considerable attention to policies that can be expected to produce savings as well as policies that carry with them undeniable cost increases. Accommodating larger numbers of lower-division students in the Community Colleges rather than in the universities, taking advantage of unused capacity in private institutions, developing a coordinated system of long-range planning, and other actions recommended by the Commission will produce long-term savings of substantial magnitude. Moreover, investment in postsecondary education will pay off in greater economic growth and, if true equity is achieved, lower costs for law enforcement, welfare, and other social programs.

In most cases, however, the probable costs of the Commission's recommendations are more easily identified than the potential savings. Based upon the data available to the Commission at this time and certain assumptions as to decisions by the Governor, Legislature, and governing boards, it appears that (as detailed in Appendix C) if all the Commission's recommendations were to be adopted, the total additional annual cost in 1988-89 would be approximately $252 million and quantifiable total savings of approximately $10 million for a net cost increase of about $242 million (as compared with current annual state support totaling nearly $5 billion). Approximately $98.3 million of the increase would result from enrollment growth.

Nearly three decades ago, in the face of projected sharp increases in cost, the authors of the 1960 Master Plan were confident that "whatever is required in the future to offer qualified students an efficient program of public higher education will be provided by the citizens of the state." The members of this Commission share that confidence today. We believe that the citizens of this state will continue to be committed to supporting a postsecondary education system that is unified, equitable, of the highest quality, and efficiently operated.

There is, however, an important obstacle to the fulfillment of this commitment. Article XIIIB of the California Constitution, adopted by the voters in 1979, establishes a limit on state and local spending that in the past few years has begun to loom as a serious threat to the state's ability to adequately support education at all levels. Under the provisions of Article XIIIB, state population growth determines how much can be spent for education, but enrollment in the public schools and in postsecondary institutions has been growing much faster than the state's population. Thus, it is likely to be increasingly difficult to maintain current levels of spending, quite apart from implementing the reforms and effecting the other changes that are called for in this and other recent studies of California's educational-system.

There may be ways in which the Governor and Legislature can postpone the impact of Article XIIIB. It is likely, however, that Californians will be called upon to choose between repealing or modifying Article XIIIB or abandoning their traditional commitment to educational opportunity. We believe that they should not abandon that commitment.

APPENDIX A

SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix A Supplementary Recommendations

Following are a group of supplementary recommendations which expand upon and clarify recommendations made in the main body of the report. In general, the supplementary recommendations include detailed specifics inappropriate to easy reading of the main text. The supplementary recommendations, however, are to be fully considered in the revision of the Master Plan.

1. Intersegmental Coordinating Council

The California Education Round Table is established in Chapter I as the primary body responsible for necessary operational linkage between the segments within the larger educational system. The Round Table, in turn, needs an administrative, coordinating, and recommending staff agency to facilitate cooperation among the segments. **Therefore, the Commission recommends:**

> *The California Education Round Table shall establish an Inter-segmental Coordinating Council to assist it in carrying out its responsibilities. This Council shall be made up of senior staff from each segment and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and shall include representatives of the academic senates and students of each postsecondary segment.*

2. Intersegmental Degree Programs Board

The California Education Round Table is charged in Chapters I and III with creating and overseeing an Intersegmental Degree Programs Board to guide studies of the need for intersegmental degree programs. **To facilitate the development of an effective board, the Commission recommends:**

> *The Intersegmental Degree Programs Board shall be composed of appointees representing the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, as well as representatives from the independent colleges and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The funding for the Intersegmental Degree Programs Board shall be through the California State University budget, and staff shall be under the direction of the Intersegmental Degree Programs Board.*
>
> *The Intersegmental Degree Programs Board shall examine the issue of access to and need for intersegmental graduate degree programs, as one of its tasks. Such intersegmental degree programs as the Intersegmental Degree Programs Board recommends shall be subject*

to the normal review processes of the segments as well as those of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The development of policies and procedures for such intersegmental degrees, a regular review of and reporting of such programs, and a process for airing differences shall be the responsibility of the California Education Round Table.

The Intersegmental Degree Programs Board shall be charged with the responsibility to find ways to use all of the state's postsecondary education resources in meeting determined needs and eliminating obstacles to a more expansive use of intersegmental graduate degrees. The effectiveness of the Intersegmental Degree Programs Board and the intersegmental degree in meeting students access to and need for doctoral education shall be subject to review in five years by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

3. Community College Governance

In Chapter I, the Commission recommends significant strengthening of Community College governance. **Following are detailed recommendations as to how that strengthening is to be accomplished.**

The California Community Colleges shall be reestablished in statute as a unified state-local postsecondary system. They shall no longer be designated in statute as secondary schools or schools that make up a part of the public school system. The California Community Colleges should have the following characteristics:

- *State Governing Board*

  The California Community Colleges shall be administered by a Board of Governors with the following membership: the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Chancellor as ex officio members; twelve members appointed by the Governor for eight-year terms, of which four are to be past or present members of district governing boards; one faculty member and one student member.

- *Powers and Duties*

  The Board of Governors shall appoint the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and confirm the appointment of district chief executive officers.

The Board of Governors shall have comprehensive authority with regard to academic affairs, including, but not limited to student academic standards, approval of courses and programs, and approval of campus academic plans. This authority may be delegated to the district governing boards or the academic senates as the Board deems appropriate.

All state support for the Community Colleges shall be appropriated to the Board of Governors according to nonstatutory formulas. The Board shall determine by regulation how this support is to be allocated among the districts.

The Board of Governors shall establish minimum standards for the employment of academic and administrative staff by the districts.

The Chancellor's Office shall be removed from the state civil service system (by amendment of the California Constitution) and a separate merit system established by statute. The Legislature shall authorize the Board of Governors to determine where the Office of the Chancellor should be located.

- *Local Governing Boards*

  The state shall be divided into Community College Districts, each with a locally elected governing board responsible for the operation of one or more Community Colleges. Two or more existing districts may be consolidated or otherwise reorganized subject to approval by the Board of Governors.

  Each district governing board shall consist of five to nine members elected to four-year terms plus one student member serving a one-year term. Elections for district governing boards shall be held in November of even-numbered years.

- *Powers and Duties*

  The district governing boards shall appoint the district chief executive officers, subject to confirmation by the Board of Governors, and shall employ all other district personnel as provided by law.

  The district governing boards shall have such responsibilities for the academic and financial affairs of the district as are delegated by the Board of Governors.

4. Budget Formulas

In Chapter IV (Recommendation 27), the California Postsecondary Education Commission is charged to take the lead in a regular examination of the equity of state budget formulas. The review should include the impact of such formulas on workload issues such as class size and teacher load.

5. Remedial Education

In Chapter II, the Commission recommends that the four-year institutions continue in the immediate future to offer remediation necessary to success for those students the universities choose to admit. However, there must be limits to such remediation as suggested by the recommendation for establishment of academic floors below which remediation will not be offered. A taxonomy of remediation has been developed by the segments in cooperation with the Commission staff. **This taxonomy is outlined below.**

> *Except in the most exceptional circumstances, and then only in the case of special-action students, the University of California should not offer remedial courses below "Pre-College Level 1," and the California State University should not offer such courses below "Pre-College Level 2" as defined in the remediation taxonomy.*

Remediation Taxonomy

Levels of Instruction	Levels of Student	Examples of Courses	
		Math	English
University Level	Students who are college-ready and likely to succeed in the freshman-level courses.	Calculus, Pre-Calculus, Analyt. Geom.	Freshman Composition (Eng. 1 A)
Pre-College Level 1*	(A) Students who are college-ready except for minimal specific skill deficiencies that require instruction one level below the Freshman level in English and/or Math.	Adv. Algebra Int. Algebra Trigonometry	Subject A or one course below Fr. Comp. (Eng. 1A)
Pre-College Level 2	(B) Students who are nearly college-ready, but exhibit serious multiple skill deficiencies that require instruction at two levels below the Fr. Level in Eng. and/or Math. (Also, II.S. college-prep students.)	Geometry Elementary Alg.	Courses two levels below Fr. Comp. (Eng. 1A)
High School Diploma	Noncollege-ready in need of high school level skills in various disciplines (i.e., below College Prep. level).	General Math (2 years required courses not specified)	Paragraphs, sentence structure, reading skills at 9-12th-grade level.
Junior High Level	Nonhigh school-ready, in need of jr. high school level skills in various disciplines.	Arithmetic	Basic reading and beginning sentence skills in courses at the 7-9th-grade level.
Elementary Level	Nonhigh school-ready, in need of elementary school level skills in various disciplines.		Above skills but at 6th-grade level and below.
Developmental/Basic Living Skills Level	Students operating below elementary level or who need basic life and coping skills.	Counting	Most basic English vocabulary and speaking skills.

*Courses listed under Pre-College Level 1 may not be considered remedial and are sometimes given degree credit by UC, CSU, and the CCC.

APPENDIX B

RECOMMENDED STUDIES

The Commission recommends the following one-time studies in support of specific elements in the revised Master Plan:

1. State-Supported Noncredit Instruction

Because of conflicting views as to the proper scope and purpose of state support for noncredit instruction in the Community Colleges, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, in consultation with the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, shall conduct a study of the current and projected need for noncredit instruction, including the ten state-funded areas, in the Community Colleges and public school system adult schools.

If the study finds that there is continued need for some or all of such programs in the Community Colleges, it will delineate the scope of such programs. The findings of the study will be reported to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. The Board will review the CPEC findings and determine which state-supported programs are postsecondary and should continue to receive state support, which should be offered only as fee-supported community service courses, and which should be assigned to the adult schools. The Board may also determine where exceptions are appropriate because "adult education" is offered solely or largely by the Community College districts.

2. English as a Second Language

The CPEC task force on ESL programs, recommended in Chapter II, should include representatives from postsecondary education, the adult education sections of the State Department of Education, professional organizations such as CATESOL representing those involved in teaching ESL, and representatives of the secondary schools.

3. Private Postsecondary Education Accreditation

The California Postsecondary Education Commission should begin its statutorily mandated review of existing standards and the appropriate administrative structure for state supervision of private postsecondary institutions by no later than 1988.

In conducting its review, CPEC should specifically consider consolidation of the "approved" and "authorized" categories of licensure for nonaccredited degree-granting institutions; prohibition of nonaccredited institutions from operating

in the state; establishment of a single process of licensure for all private institutions; modification of existing statutory language to delete references to comparability between approved and accredited institutions; prohibition of nonaccredited institutions from granting degrees beyond the baccalaureate; establishment of a hierarchy of licensure in which institutions would be required to move to accredited status within a stipulated period of time; establish the Council for Private Postsecondary Education Institutions and the Office of Private Postsecondary Education as an entity separate from the State Department of Education; and restructure the membership of the Council on Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions to provide a majority of lay citizens without current or prior employment or business connections to private postsecondary institutions that fall under the Council's jurisdiction.

APPENDIX C

ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix C Summary of Estimated Costs of Recommendations

Rec. No.	Subject	Estimated Costs 1988-89	Estimated Costs Future Years
2	CSU Research	$ 14,500,000	Cont.
3	Lower-Division Enrollment	—	—
5	Community College Governance	1,500,000	Cont.
7	Performance Funding	—	—
8	Minority and Women Faculty	7,100,000	Cont.
8	Graduate Student Finitncial Aid	3,100,000	Cont.
9	Student Aid Guarantee	—	$12,000,000[1]
9	Maximum Cal Grant Award	34,000,000	Cont.
9	Balance Loans and Grants	56,000,000	Cont.
10	Support for Degree Study	24,100,000	Cont.
11	Retention Rates	9,000,000 [1]	45,000,000 [1]
11	Retention Rates for Special Admits	2,800,000 [1]	14,000,000 [1]
11	Remedial Instruction and Counseling	7,500,000	Cont.
11	English as a Second Language	70,000	—
12	Professional Service to Schools	2,260,000	Cont.
14	Undergraduate Instructional Quality	3,325,000	Cont.
17	Faculty Development	—	—
20	CPEC Program Review	60,000	Cont.
22	New Instructional Technologies	—	—
24	Long-Range Planning	225,000	Cont.
29	Community College Credit Enrollment Cap	86,500,000 [1]	Cont.
32	Nonresident Tuition	(10,000,000) [2]	Cont.
1	Intersegmental Coordinating Council	—	500,000
		$ 242,040,000	$301,670,000

[1] Cost increases totaling $98.3 million in 1988-89 and $157.5 million in future years resulting from enrollment growth.

[2] Savings.

Estimated Costs of the Commission's Recommendations

A number of the Commission's recommendations for changes in the Master Plan will entail additional cost to the state either as a result of enrollment growth or to fund program changes. One recommendation will result in quantifiable savings. Several other recommendations, those that provide for accommodating the great majority of lower-division students in the Community Colleges, taking advantage of unused capacity in the private institutions, and developing a coordinated system of long-range planning, for example, will also result in substantial long-term savings to the state's taxpayers. Although such savings cannot be quantified, they are every bit as real as the costs that can be estimated.

The estimated costs of (or savings from) specific recommendations are summarized on the preceding page. It must be understood, however, that in most cases these estimates are based upon assumptions regarding decisions to be made by the Governor, the Legislature, and the segmental governing boards. Thus, the estimates can only illustrate the magnitude of the potential cost within a broad range of possibilities.

The following is a more detailed statement of the assumptions behind and data source for each of the recommendations. Wherever possible, the estimates are based upon 1986-87 or 1987-88 data and future costs are expressed at current prices. Recommendations believed to have only minor additional costs and recommendations for which funding has already been authorized have been excluded.

The recommendation numbers correspond to those in the text of the report. Several have more than one cost element.

Recommendation No. 2

Subject: State support for CSU research.

Estimated Cost: $14.5 million

Assumptions: The cost of replacing one full-time CSU faculty member is $30,000. There will be 14,084 full-time faculty employed by CSU in 1987-88. If ten percent are given one-third released time to conduct research, their replacement cost will be $14 million. If additional support costs average $1,000 per researcher, there will be added support cost totaling $467,000. Indeterminable expenditures for facilities and equipment may also be required.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based on CSU budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 3

Subject: Achievement and maintenance of 40 percent ceiling on lower-division enrollment as a percentage of total undergraduate enrollment at UC and CSU.

Estimated Savings: Indeterminable.

Assumptions: If lower-division students who would otherwise enroll at a UC campus choose instead to enroll first in a Community College, there will be a reduction in total UC enrollment and a corresponding reduction in state cost equivalent to the differences in UC and Community College lower-division costs. If, however, UC increases its enrollment of upper-division (transfer) students to compensate for the decline in lower-division enrollment, UC support costs will not change, and state costs will actually increase with the increase in Community College enrollment. In the long run, however, implementation of this recommendation should result in significant savings to the state by reducing UC lower-division enrollment growth and encouraging many more students to obtain their lower-division instruction at a Community College.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon UC undergraduate enrollment projection (October 1986) and marginal cost data prepared by the Legislative Analyst and UC.

Recommendation No. 5

Subject: State-local governance system for the California Community Colleges.

Estimated Cost: $1,500,000

Assumptions: The increase in the responsibilities of the Board of Governors will require an increase in the Chancellor's staff. If 25 positions are added at an average cost of $60,000 each, the added cost will be $1.5 million. Additional costs at the district level are not included in this estimate.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based on Board of Governor's budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 7

Subject: Performance-driven funding incentives related to equity.

Estimated Cost: Indeterminable additional developmental, administrative, and incentive costs.

Recommendation No. 8

Subject: Early identification, recruitment, and training of minority and women students for faculty and administrative positions.

Estimated Cost: $7.1 million

Assumptions: If this program requires two additional staff positions for each of the public segments, the cost for salaries and expenses will be approximately $500,000. An additional expenditure of $5.8 million will provide 100 early faculty appointments for the California State University (at $40,000 each), 40 for the University of California (at $60,000 each), and $100,000 each for program administration. The costs of increases in graduate student aid and other factors are included under other recommendations.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon data from UC and CSU.

Recommendation No. 8

Subject: Increased support for graduate student financial aid.

Estimated Cost: $3.1 million

Assumptions: If the existing graduate fellowship program is doubled in size, there will be additional costs of $3 million for awards and approximately $100,000 for administration.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based on data in the Governor's Budget and the Analysis of the Budget Bill for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 9

Subject: Guarantee of student aid.

Estimated Cost: No immediate increase in cost; future cost increases of approximately $12 million.

Assumptions: The guarantee of student aid for students who make themselves eligible for admission to UC or CSU is not likely to have an immediate impact on support costs. In time, however, if it results in an undergraduate enrollment increase of approximately 500 students for UC and 1,500 students for CSU, the increase in operating costs for the two segments would be approximately $7.7 million at current support levels. If the additional students receive Cal Grant awards averaging $1,500 (CSU) and $4,000 (UC), the increases in student aid costs would be $4,250,000.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon data in the Governor's Budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 9

Subject: Increasing maximum Cal Grant award to average cost for UC and CSU.

Estimated Cost: $34 million

Assumptions: The maximum Cal Grant A award is now $4,320. If the operating cost per undergraduate student is $5,000 at CSU and $9,000 at UC, for an average of $7,000 for the two segments, then the maximum award amount would be increased by $2,680. If one-third of Cal Grant recipients continue to enroll in independent institutions, and their average grant increases by 90 percent of the maximum grant increase, the additional cost will be $34 million.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon data from the Governor's Budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 9

Subject: Balancing loans and grants in providing student financial aid for California students attending California institutions. Public service employment to repay student loans.

Estimated Cost: $56 million

Assumptions: Loan funds exceeded grant aid for all sources by approximately $90 million in 1986-87. Grant aid will have to be increased by an additional $56 million (over the $34 million increase above) to reach equality, assuming no change in loan funds. The

substantial cost of administering public service employment cannot be estimated at this time.

Data Source: Analysis of the Budget Bill for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 10

Subject: State support for all CSU and UC matriculated enrollment in courses leading to a degree.

Estimated Cost: $24.1 million

Assumptions: For UC, it is assumed that all summer session and 9.16 percent of extension students are matriculated for degree credit and that 100 percent of current fee income ($19.9 million) from such students would be replaced by state support. For CSU, it is assumed that fee increases for all "special session" instruction ($14.2 million) would be replaced by state support.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based on data from UC and CSU budget staffs.

Recommendation No. 11

Subject: Retention rates at CSU for regularly admitted students.

Estimated Cost: $9 million increasing to $45 million

Assumptions: CSU enrollment will increase one percent per year to a total increase of five percent in five years as a consequence of improved retention. At current support levels, each one percent increase will cost $9 million.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon Governor's Budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 11

Subject: Improvement of retention rates at UC and CSU for special-action admittees.

Estimated Cost: $2.8 million increasing to $14 million.

Assumptions: Improving retention rates for special-action admittees may be expected to increase enrollment in each segment. If enrollment is increased over a five-year period by one percent for each, the approximate additional cost at current support levels will be $2.8 million in 1988-89 rising to $14 million by 1992-93.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon 1987-88 Governor's Budget data.

Recommendation No. 11

Subject: State-funded remedial instruction accompanied by student assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up.

Estimated Cost: $7.5 million

Assumptions: Additional student assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up at UC and CSU is likely to require at least 2 FTE positions per campus at an average cost of $55,000 per position. The Governor and Legislature have previously agreed to support assessment, counseling, placement, and follow-up at the Community Colleges. The additional cost of funding UC remedial courses would be $4.5 million.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate reviewed by segments; UC budget staff estimate for remedial course costs.

Recommendation No. 11

Subject: CPEC task force study of English as a Second Language.

Estimated Cost: $70,000

Assumptions: The task force will consist of representatives of the interested agencies as recommended with necessary support costs.

Data Source: CPEC

Recommendation No. 12

Subject: High priority for teacher education; faculty rewards for professional service to the public schools.

Estimated Cost: $2,260,000

Assumptions: The cost of implementing this recommendation is indeterminable at this time, but one-third released time for 20 faculty at each of UC's eight general campuses and one-quarter for 20 faculty at each of CSU's 19 campuses, at an average of $4,000 each, would amount to $2,160,000. An additional $100,000 may be required to establish a Community College pilot program.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate reviewed by segmental staff.

Recommendation No. 14

Subject: Performance reports on undergraduate instructional quality.

Estimated Cost: $3,325,000

Assumptions: Average cost of $25,000 per campus for each of 133 UC, CSU, and CCC campuses.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate.

Recommendation No. 17

Subject: Faculty professional development at all three public segments.

Estimated Cost: To be determined following CPEC study. CSU requested $1.6 million for a faculty development program in its 1987-88 budget. A Community College program is estimated to cost approximately $9 million.

Assumptions: CSU 1987-88 cost estimates based upon providing sabbatical leaves for 32 additional faculty positions ($.9 million) and additional travel expenses for professional purposes ($.6 million). The Community Colleges estimate is based upon an expense equal to approximately one percent of faculty and administrative salaries for 1985-86.

Data Source: CSU Budget for 1987-88; Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

Recommendation No. 20

Subject: CPEC program review office.

Estimated Cost: $60,000

Assumptions: One additional CPEC staff to review 30-40 existing programs annually.

Data Source: CPEC

Recommendation No. 22

Subject: CSU research and evaluation of new instructional technologies.

Estimated Cost: Included under Recommendation 2, above.

Recommendation No. 24

Subject: CPEC's long-range planning responsibilities.

Estimated Cost: $225,000

Assumptions: The new responsibilities of CPEC with respect to long-range planning, including long-range enrollment projections, will require an additional $150,000 in personnel support and $75,000 for operating expenses, principally data storage and processing.

Data Source: CPEC

Recommendation No. 29

Subject: Removal of "cap" on state support for enrollment growth in Community College credit courses.

Estimated Cost: $86.5 million

Assumptions: Removal of the existing "cap" on state support might result in an increase in state-supported credit enrollment of as much as five percent. State-supported credit enrollment (ADA) is estimated at 591,387 for 1987-88, and state support (from all state and local sources) will average $2,925 per ADA. Extending these figures into 1988-89, a five percent increase would increase state costs by $86.5 million.

Data Source: Analysis of the Budget Bill and Governor's Budget for 1987-88.

Recommendation No. 32

Subject: Nonresident tuition

Estimated Savings: $10 million

Assumptions: Currently, there are 8,400 nonresident students enrolled at CSU and 12,000 at UC. Based upon reported nonresident charges for 1986-87, it appears that this recommendation might increase nonresident tuition at CSU and UC by amounts that might result in a total savings to the state on the order of $10 million. Inasmuch as the charge for each segment is to be no greater than the average charge for comparable institutions in other states, however, and the number and names of those institutions are now being negotiated with the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst, a more precise estimate cannot be made at this time.

Data Source: Commission staff estimate based upon data from MPC Background Papers and Analysis of the Budget Bill for 1987-88.

Supplemental Recommendations -- No. 1

Subject: Intersegmental Coordinating Council.

Estimated Cost: None in 1988-89; possible request of $500,000 per year in the future.

Assumptions: The ICC will be funded initially from contributions from the participating segments and agencies. A future request for direct state support is likely, however.

Data Source: Draft organization and plan for the ICC, dated May 24,1987.

APPENDIX D

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND DISSENTS

Commissioner Henry Der voted against approval of the Commission's report. Letters from the Chairman and other Commissioners are attached.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA **GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor**

COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
1215 FIFTEENTH STREET, SECOND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-0132

J. Gary Shansby
Chalrman

William D. Campbell
Vice Chairman

Commissioners

Seth P. Brunner
Henry Der
Patsy Estreiias
Claudia Hampton, Ed.D.
Bill Honig
Meredith J. Khachigian
George David Kieffer, Esq.
Felix S. LeMarinei
Peter A. McCuen, Ph.D.
Edward R. Mosiey, M.D.
Michael R. Peevey
Ray Remy
Glenn Rothner
Harold M. Willlams

Executive Director
Lee R. Kerschner, Ph.D.

August 3, 1987

The Honorable George Deukmejian,
Governor, State of California

The Honorable David A. Roberti
President pro Tempore of the Senate

The Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Gentlemen:

As Chairman of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, I would like to make a few comments about the final report, the Commission, and the manner in which it carried out its responsibilities.

I believe that the Commission has been very effective over the past two-and-a-half years in meeting the challenge presented to us by SB 1570. The Commissioners were appointed by the Governor, the President pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the Assembly and represented a very broad range of interests and viewpoints. Yet from their first meeting they put their commitment to education before any other commitment. Despite their many other responsibilities, 15 of the 16 Commissioners served the entire term of the Commission. Only Commissioner Rothner served for less than a full term, having been appointed following completion of the study of the Community Colleges. Attendance at the meetings exceeded 85 percent, and all Commissioners participated actively in debating the issues that came before us.

In addition to the participation by the Commissioners, we received excellent input on a consistent basis from representatives of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, the independent colleges and universities, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the Department of Education. Throughout the study, Commission meetings and public hearings were well attended by senior staff of the segments. We were also pleased to have continuing advice and counsel from students, faculty, union organizations, campus administrators, chief executive officers, local and statewide governing board members, legislative and gubernatorial staffs, and authorities on education from across the country. In summary, the participation and involvement of everyone was very gratifying.

I believe that the Commission carefully reviewed all matters of importance that came before it, focused its attention on the most important policy issues, and debated those issues openly and at length. Moreover, it did so in a spirit of cooperation and dedication to the task at hand. The first report, Challenge of Change, which dealt solely with the California Community Colleges, was approved by unanimous vote of the Commission. Three Commissioners who dissented on a few issues explained their positions in letters that were included in background documents to the report. The final report, The Master Plan Renewed, was approved by all Commissioners with the exception- of Commissioner Henry Der. Appended to the report is a letter from Commissioner Der explaining his position, a letter from Commissioner Williams clarifying his support for one set of recommendations, and a letter from Commissioner Rothner dissenting from two recommendations.

Commissioner Rothner's letter also outlines his view of the Commission's process and composition. I am confident that the majority of the Commission disagrees with this view and believes that his comments are inappropriate and inaccurate. The Commission was able to review all matters of importance in significant detail and was able to make a strong case for each of the recommendations it presents in the report.

The Commission is hopeful that the Joint Legislative Committee and the Governor will review our recommendations and will propose and approve supporting legislation that will strengthen higher education in California. The recommendations cover all of the most pressing issues, and, we believe, deal effectively with the needs of our citizens well into the next century.

On a personal note, I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to serve as Chairman of the Commission. I have enjoyed the process, and I am very proud of the Commission, the staff, and the participation of so many people who have contributed to those recommendations. I endorse the final report in its entirety.

Sincerely,

J. Gary Shansby
Chairman

REICH, ADELL & CROST
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

501 SHATTO PLACE, SUITE 100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, 90020
(213) 386-3860

JULIUS REICH
HIRSCH ADELL
PAUL CROST
GLENN ROTHNER
ALEXANDER B. CVITAN

ANTHONY R. SEGALL
JOHN RUBIN
MARIANNE REINHOLD
ADAM RADINSKY
DELLA BAHAN

July 27, 1987

Mr. J. Gary Shansby, Chairman
Commission for the Review of the
Master Plan for Higher Education
1215 Fifteenth Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Gary:

Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to express a few disagreements and concluding thoughts on "The Master Plan Renewed" and the process that led to its adoption.

The comments that follow should not be misinterpreted as general disagreement with our process or report, which I voted to adopt and generally endorse. I am particularly pleased with the recommendations designed to increase the representation among the students and faculty of underrepresented segments of our diverse society, the recognition that educational quality suffers from increased student-faculty ratios and excessive use of part-time faculty, and the Commission's warning to the public that we can maintain educational opportunity and quality only through the repeal or modification of Article XIII(B) of the State Constitution--the Gann Limitation.

Community College Governance

The Commission% focus upon improving the quality of education in the community colleges was both useful and necessary; changes in governance in that system are no doubt required to achieve that end. I agree with the thrust of the report's recommendations urging a strengthening of the powers and authority of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges so as to enable the Board of Governors to better represent the community colleges before the Legislature and to establish and enforce statewide programs and policies.

However, I believe the Commission has gone too far in recommending that the Board of Governors have primary responsibility with respect to academic and financial administration of

the colleges, whereas the district governing boards will have only such responsibilities in these areas as are delegated to them by the Board of Governors. Thus, I dissent from recommendation no. 5 and supplemental recommendation no. 3.

My dissent stems from both policy and practical disagreement. I supported options debated among us that would have permitted the Board of Governors and the Chancellor to review the academic and financial administration of the colleges and require the establishment of uniform policies and programs, with the added option of temporarily taking over the operation of a district in an appropriate case where mismanagement so required. But the governance structure recommended in our final report relegates local governing boards to an insignificant status and deprives them, in cases where local governance works well, of fulfilling their proper function in responding to the particular educational and program needs of their community, needs which differ by region and demography. Further, the report fails to identify how the new governance structure would work in practice at the local governing board level, and I fear that a system which calls for the election by the community of a board which is then given only such authority over academic and financial management and policy as an appointed statewide board deems appropriate is destined to fail. Rather than promote unity, this new structure is likely to promote antagonism between the community and Sacramento. The local governing boards are likely to be viewed and treated as unwanted appendages, and they will likely rebel.

Pilot Programs of Rolling Contracts for Community College Faculty

The recommendation (no. 16) that the Board of Governors develop pilot programs of rolling contracts for community college faculty was first adopted in the "Challenge of Change," prior to my appointment to the Commission. Had I been present at that time, I would have pointed out that:

(1) The colleges use part-time faculty for purposes of salary and benefit savings (they pay them at lower rates and do not provide most fringe benefits) and flexibility in regard to time of course offerings, not flexibility in regard to the avoidance of tenure;

(2) The colleges already have a quick, efficient mechanism under the Education Code for the avoidance of tenure where the concern is declining enrollment or reduced interest in particular course offerings-layoff;

(3) Rolling contracts will, therefore, provide no benefit to the colleges or the part-time faculty. The colleges will still have an incentive to use the cheaper, part-time faculty, and the part-time faculty will have no greater leverage in escaping the multiple appointments trap;

(4) The only outcome of the pilot program will be to permit colleges to lengthen the probationary period, or avoid tenure completely, for those faculty hired under rolling contracts. The colleges will have every reason to hire persons who otherwise would have been given probationary status under rolling contracts instead, thereby providing a lengthier, no-strings-attached opportunity for the colleges to evaluate new faculty.

In short, I dissent from recommendation no. 16 because I am not in favor of unlimited probationary periods. Rather, I support the traditional method used in our society to select higher education faculty and guarantee that those selected will have freedom to teach without interference resulting from managerial whim or political interference and with sufficient economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability: tenure awarded upon satisfactory completion of a reasonable probationary period.

The Commission's Process and Composition

With the clearer vision that comes only from hindsight, and without any motive to criticize the Governor, the Legislature, the Commission, or its staff for the less than clear vision that necessarily comes with foresight, I offer the following thoughts on the Commission% composition and process.

We are a "blue ribbon" commission composed primarily of lay persons not chosen to represent a higher education constituency. Blue ribbon, lay commissions serve a useful purpose in our society when properly directed to provide an external, impartial citizens' perspective on matters of social policy. Often, only lay "outsiders" can ask the probing questions and make the significant criticisms that our institutions periodically require.

Institutionally-based, expert commissions also have their place in our society, especially where a commission% task is to promote segmental cooperation and financial and administrative efficiency or to undertake research designed to inform public policy discussions. Such a commission was the group that created the 1960 Master Plan.

We tried, as a blue ribbon commission, to assume the role of the institutionally-based, expert commission. We should have set out to identify a handful of significant issues in higher education and contented ourselves with asking probing questions and making appropriate criticisms and recommendations. Instead, we set out to undertake a comprehensive revision of the 1960 Master Plan, recognizing much later that we had assumed to great a burden.

Some of our recommendations would have benefitted from segmentally-directed study and debate. The prime example, in my view, is the community college state-local governance recommendation, from which I dissented. I believe a more workable and better policy would have been achieved through discussions in which the competing constituencies were the "insiders" in the debate. In our process, they were necessarily viewed as "outsiders."

Other recommendations would have benefitted from research and statistical surveys among the segments. Again, I offer as an example a recommendation from which I dissented--rolling contracts for faculty. We had no empirical data to suggest a need for such a program and we failed even to think through its consequences. The same lack of data exists with regard to other recommendations I support, namely, reductions in excessive faculty student-faculty ratios in the California State University and the improvement in the quality of undergraduate education in the University of California. Input from and research directed by segmental representatives having "insider," rather than "outsider" status would have corrected some of those shortcomings.

In light of our composition, the scope of our delegated tasks, and the small, albeit able and dedicated, staff we had available to us, we were unable to make the best case possible for some of our most important recommendations. In many of those areas, the creation of an institutionally-based, expert commission would have been preferable. In short, I recommend that in the future the Governor and the Legislature refrain from simply choosing either a blue ribbon, lay commission or an institutionally-based, expert commission. Each has its proper place and function; neither is sufficient by itself for all purposes.

Finally, please do not mistake these thoughts for regret. They are, I believe, a proper part of our function in fully informing the Governor and the Legislature concerning our processes. On balance, I am satisfied with the report and enjoyed the experience of serving on the Commission. Congratulations to you, our fellow Commissioners, and our Executive Director and staff.

Very truly yours,

Glenn Rothner

GR:mc

THE J. PAUL GETTY TRUST

Harold M. Williams, President and Chief Executive Officer

July 21, 1987

Mr. J, Gary Shansby
Chairman
Commission to Review the Master Plan
1215 Fifteenth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Gary:

With the issuance of "The Master Plan Renewed" the Commission completes its mandate to assure the vitality of higher education in California into the next century. You, Executive Director Kerschner and the Commission staff are to be commended for the leadership in what has been accomplished over the past two and a half years. By placing the objective of strengthening the Community Colleges at the forefront of this State's policy agenda, the Commission has made a particularly significant contribution to the future of California higher education. I can assure you and the Commission of the University's full support of the essential and critical efforts to ensure the revitalization of the Community College transfer function.

It does seem to me necessary, however, to state my understanding of the section of our report dealing with "A Unified Admissions and Transfer System." The text quite correctly makes the point that neither UC nor CSU achieved compliance with the 1960 Master Plan's goal of 40/60 ratio of lower division to upper division students by turning away eligible students. Rather, students chose to attend the Community Colleges and then to transfer. The University has consistently maintained a commitment, with the required budgetary support of every governor and legislature, to offer a place somewhere within the University system for every eligible student wishing to enroll at UC.

1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300 Los Angeles, California 90067-2561 Telephone 213 277-9188 Telefax 5568215

While this commitment is not as clearly acknowledged in the text as it might be, I support the Commission's recommendations for strengthening the transfer function, which in our report now links together the three critical elements of this process:

(1) the legislature's willingness to fund transfer education at an appropriate level

(2) the Community Colleges' ability to attract students by delivering quality transfer education

(3) the University's ability to attract and accept Community College transfers as upper division students.

It would be impossible for the University to reduce its percentage of lower division enrollments without this linkage effectively in place or, alternatively, denying admission to UC eligible applicants.

I can assure you that the University stands committed to working with the Community Colleges to improve and facilitate the transfer function. I will recommend to my fellow Regents their full support of the Commission's report provided that the University is not expected to abandon its historic commitment to admit all UC eligible students wishing to enroll.

It has been a pleasure to participate on the Commission to Review the Master Plan.

Very truly yours,

Harold M. Williams

HMW:bam

APPENDIX E

THE COMMISSION AND ITS PROCESS

Postsecondary education in California is organized under the provisions of a statewide Master Plan, originally adopted in 1960. The plan delineates roles, responsibilities, governance, and coordination of the three public postsecondary systems: the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California.

The Master Plan is periodically reviewed in light of the state's changing needs to determine what, if any, changes are necessary to ensure higher education's continued success. Specific concerns about the Community Colleges and more general concerns about the ability of postsecondary education to respond to the new demographics of the state raised questions as to the extent to which the three public segments could meet changing needs. These concerns gave rise to legislation calling for a Master Plan review and the Legislature established the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570, Nielsen, Chapter 1507, Statutes of 1984) and a separate review of the Community Colleges.

The Commission is required to submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor relative to its findings and recommendations on the Master Plan by June 30,1987.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Governor's Appointees

J. Gary Shansby, San Francisco (Chairman)
William D. Campbell, Carlsbad (Vice Chairman)
Meredith J. Khachigian, San Clemente
Edward R. Mosley, Fresno

Senate Rules Committee Appointees

Patsy Estrellas, Anaheim
Felix S. LeMarinel, Palmdale
Glenn Rothner, Los Angeles

Assembly Speaker's Appointees

Henry Der, San Francisco
Peter McCuen, Rancho Cordova
Michael R. Peevey, La Canada Flintridge

University of California Regents' Appointee

Harold M. Williams, Los Angeles

California State University Trustees' Appointee

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles

Community College Board of Governors Appointee

George David Kieffer, Los Angeles

California Postsecondary Education Commissions Appointee

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento

Superintendent of Public Instruction's Appointee

Bill Honig, Sacramento
Harvey Hunt, Sacramento (Superintendent's Designee)
Xavier Del Buono (Superintendent's Designee/Community College Study)

Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities' Appointee

Ray Remy, Los Angeles

COMMISSION STAFF

Lee R. Kerschner, Executive Director
Jerome Evans, Executive Staff
Julia B. Fahrenbruch, Executive Staff
Robert S. Palacio, Executive Staff
Ronald W. Saufley, Executive Staff
Kim Pennino and Katherine E. Johnson, Offke Assistants
A. Alan Post, Interim Executive Director (1985)
Janis Cox Coffey, Executive Staff (Community College Study)
Murray Haberman, Executive Staff (April 1986 to November 1986)

The Community College Reassessment Study

Simultaneously with the establishment of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Legislature adopted and the Governor signed SB 2064 (Stiern), Chapter 1506, 1984. This legislation mandated a special Community College reassessment study as the Commission's first priority and requested a special report to the Legislature and Governor by March 30, 1986. The Commission adopted that report, titled The *Challenge of Change,* on March 18 1986. The recommendations in the report were subject to revision and supplement as the Commission began its work on the Master Plan as a whole.

The Master Plan Process

In April and May 1986, the Commission began its review of the Master Plan for postsecondary education with four days of presentations by distinguished academic leaders, followed by a three-day retreat in June during which the Commissioners established an agenda for their work. This included a lengthy list of issues, goals, and expectations.

The Commission adhered to a rigorous schedule, conducting 14 open, 2-day meetings (one per month), public hearings that included presentations from members of the Legislature and their staffs; presidents, chancellors, administrative staff, faculty, and student representatives from the postsecondary segments; representatives of the independent colleges and universities; representatives of the Department of Education and the public schools, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission; professional researchers; and others. The Commission distributed over 550 copies of its monthly meeting agenda and background materials to representatives of the postsecondary education community, students, libraries, and the general public for comments and criticisms.

The Commission's consideration of a variety of policy options was supplemented at each meeting by the Chair's recognition of individuals in the audience who had comments and advice to contribute. Written comments from the public were encouraged and, when received, were distributed to all Commissioners. Regular meetings were exceptionally well attended and all Commissioners actively participated in the exploration of issues before the Commission.

The Executive Director had the advice and counsel of faculty, students, and segmental staff advisory groups, and met regularly with campus and segmental chief executive officers. Informal advisory groups of faculty, students, and others met to discuss pertinent issues under Commission consideration. In addition, the Chair, Vice-Chair, individual Commissioners, and the Executive Director participated in numerous student, faculty, governing board, and organizational conferences and meetings held both locally and statewide.

The Commission reviewed and synthesized a substantial amount of research, statistics, background material, and other information throughout its work on the Master Plan. Background materials were provided to help the Commissioners frame issues and 16 separate issue papers provided a broad range of policy options. The issue papers received two Commission readings. First drafts were specifically intended to express every conceivable policy option; second drafts reflected the Commission's first-draft discussions as to deletions, additions, and highlights. From these second drafts, the Master Plan report was written. (Background and issue papers, as well as detailed minutes reflecting the Commission's discussions, are available as separate supplemental documents.)

A first rough draft of the Master Plan report was presented to the Commission in April 1987. After making revisions in style, content, and format as directed by the Commission, staff presented a second draft in May. This second draft was further revised and presented in a substantially different format in June. The Commission approved, in June, additional recommendations on Community College governance to augment its recommendations in *Challenge of Change* and subsequently transmitted it to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Final approval of the Commission's report on the Master Plan took place July 22, 1987, and the Governor and Legislature were notified that the Commission had completed its work and would be available to present the report and advocate the reforms through the rest of the year. The Commission will present its report to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in August 1987.

APPENDIX F

SB 1570 NIELSEN; CHAPTER 1507, 1984

Senate Bill No. 1570

CHAPTER 1507

An act to add and repeal Section 66903.7 of the Education Code, relating to postsecondary education. making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor September 27, 1984 Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 1984]

LEGISLATIVE COUSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1570, Nielsen. Postsecondary education: Master Plan for Higher Education: review.

(1) Under existing law, there are no provisions requiring the review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

This bill would establish the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education to be comprised of 16 members to be appointed in a prescribed manner. This bill would specify that the duties of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education shall include, but need not be limited to, the review of reports submitted by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the University of California, the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, or any other relevant reports, the conducting of public hearings. and the formulation and submission of recommendations regarding policies and the content of the master plan.

This bill would prohibit any person employed or retained by any public or private postsecondary educational institution from serving on the commission, and would authorize representatives to the commission to be reimbursed for actual and necessary travel expenses.

This bill would require the commission to select and designate a state administrative agency to carry out the personnel, contractual, and al! other fiscal services required by the commission.

This bill would state the legislative intent that any agency receiving public funds for postsecondary education shall, upon request by the commission, provide all necessary information or assistance required by the commission.

This bill would require the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education to submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor not later than January 1,1987, relative to its findings and recommendations regarding the master plan and the functions and interrelationships of public postsecondary education institutions.

This bill would make these provisions inoperative on June 30, 1987, and would repeal them as of January 1, l988.

(2) This bill would appropriate $500,000 from the General Fund to the Controller for allocation to the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education for all expenses deemed necessary by the commission without regard to fiscal years.

(3) This bill would specify that, upon completion of the study authorized by this bill, all of the documents and working papers of the commission shall become the property of the State Archives.

(4) This bill would specify that these provisions shall not become operative unless ACR 162 and SB 2064 of the 1983-84 Regular Session are both chaptered.

(5) This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Appropriation: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66903.7 is added to the Education Code, to read:

66903.7. (a) There is hereby established the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education to be comprised of 16 members who shall be citizens knowledgeable in the area of postsecondary education, business, and community leaders representative of the cultural, ethnic, and geographic diversity of the state. Members of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education shall be appointed as follows:

(1) One representative appointed by the Regents of the University of California.

(2) One representative appointed by the Trustees of the California State University.

(3) One representative appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

(4) One representative appointed from among the membership of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

(5) The Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his or her designee.

(6) Four representatives appointed by the Governor.

(7) Three representatives appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.

(8) Three representatives appointed by the Senate Rules Committee.

(9) One representative appointed by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

The Governor may designate any one of the 16 members appointed to the commission pursuant to this subdivision to serve as chairperson of the commission.

(b) No person who is employed or retained by any public or private postsecondary educational institution shall be appointed to or serve on the commission Representatives to the commission shall receive reimbursement for actual and necessary travel expenses

incurred while conducting the business of the commission.

(c) The duties of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education shall include, but need not be limited to, the review of relevant reports by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the University of California, the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, or any other reports the commission deems appropriate.

The commission shall select and designate a state administrative agency to carry out the personnel, contractual, and all other fiscal services required by the commission.

In addition, the commission shall, at a minimum, report on all of the following to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Review of the Master Plan established pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 162 of the 1983-84 Regular Session:

(1) California's postsecondary educational needs through the year 2000, with emphasis on the demography of student. societal and employment needs in the next decade versus the projected supply of postsecondary education faculty.

(2) Basic and lower division instruction at the various postsecondary institutions, with an initial emphasis on the mission and function of the California Community Colleges, as specified in Senate Bill 2064 of the 1983-84 Regular Session.

(3) Strategies to promote an increase in the access and success of students, particularly those underrepresented in postsecondary education, including adult education through graduate instruction, in the following areas:

(A) Preparation and outreach: basic skills and college preparation in kindergarten through grade 12, and community college curriculum.

(B) Matriculation: admission, assessment, and advisement.

(C) Retention: remediation, academic support, and financial assistance.

(D) Articulation: transition from secondary education to postsecondary education and employment.

(E) Accountability: assurance that courses offered are consistent with the mission of various segments of postsecondary education.

(4) The appropriateness of existing educational delivery systems and their ability to serve present and future student populations.

(5) Analysis of direct and indirect expenditures for students attending California postsecondary institutions, including student financial assistance and instructional support, as to the efficient use of state resources.

The commission shall conduct public hearings designed to solicit testimony of private citizens, public intertest groups, alumni organizations, or any other interested private groups and organizations, as well as professors, administrator, students, and others who are directly affected by that master plan, for the purpose

of soliciting the input of these groups in the formulation of the commission's recommendations regarding the master plan.

The commission shall formulate and submit recommendations regarding the policies and content of the master plan, in addition to recommendations regarding the goals, programs, functions, funding, and interrelationships of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

(c) The commission shall develop and submit a management plan identifying; the commission's specific objectives and output for review by the Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education by March 1, 1985. The management plan shall also include l resource and staffing requirements and specific dates for the completion of interim and final reports to the Joint Committee.

(d) Not later than January 1,1987, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education shall submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor relative to its findings and recommendations regarding the master plan and the functions and interrelationships of public postsecondary education institutions.

(e) It is the intent of the Legislature that any agency receiving public funds for postsecondarv education shall, upon request by the commission, provide all necessary information or assistance required by the commission.

(f) This section shall become inoperative on June 30,1987, and, as of Januarv 1, 1988, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, which becomes effective on or before January 1,1988, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 1 of this act shall not become operative unless both Assembly Concurrent Resolution 162 and Senate Bill 2064 of the 1983-84 Regular Session are chaptered, and in that case Section 1 of this act shall become operative upon the later of the effective dates of this bill, Assembly Concurrent Resolution 162, or Senate Bill 2064.

SEC. 3. The sum of five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the Controller for allocation to the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education for all expenses deemed necessary by the commission without regard to fiscal years.

SEC. 4. Upon completion of the study authorized by this act, all of the documents and working papers of the commission shall become the property of the State Archives.

SEC. 5. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order that the reassessment study of the Master Plan for Higher Education required by this act may be completed at the earliest possible time, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.

o

87 76313