14

Action Item

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Approval of the Minutes of the October 16 and December 11, 2000, Meetings

MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of October 16, 2000

Committee members present

Carol Chandler, *Chair*
Robert Hanff
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Velma Montoya
Roger Schrimp
Howard Welinsky
Guillermo Rodriguez, *ex officio*
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*

Other Commissioners present

Ralph Pesqueira
Evonne Schulze
Kyhl Smeby
Melinda G. Wilson

Committee member absent

Monica Lozano, *Vice Chair*

Call to order

Committee Chair Chandler called the October 16, 2000 meeting of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee to order at 9:40 a.m. in the California State University, Fresno Smittcamp Alumni House, Board of Directors-Whitten Conference Room, 2625 E. Keats, Fresno, California.

Approval of the minutes

Chair Chandler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the committee's August 21, 2000 meeting. It was so moved and the committee voted without dissent to approve the minutes as submitted.

The California State University, Channel Islands

Chair Chandler called upon staff member Beth Graybill to present this item. Ms. Graybill said the California State University (CSU) had proposed to establish its 23rd campus in Ventura County to be called CSU Channel Islands. She said the Commission had reviewed the proposal and acknowledged the work of other Commission staff and CSU personnel in completing this analysis and the resulting information item. She introduced Handel Evens, President of the Channel Islands campus, and Vice Provost Barbara Thorpe.

Ms. Graybill reviewed the proposal for a full-service CSU campus to open in 2002 with 1,320 full-time equivalent students on the site of the former Camarillo State Hospital. The CSU Northridge Ventura Center, which has 1,800 headcount students currently, now operates at that site and will continue in tandem with the campus until the center is

phased out, around 2005-06. She said the new campus would fulfill a long-standing desire for a CSU campus to serve the region. Among the benefits of the facility, she said that the new campus would improve statewide higher education access, increase local CSU participation rates, respond to growing regional population growth, and improve overall degree-completion rates in the region. She reviewed the campus costs and the proposed academic plan for the new campus. She said that the evidence supports a finding that the CSU Channel Islands campus would develop in accordance with statewide needs and priorities, serve the higher education needs of the community and its students, and develop an academic plan that is responsive to local educational and labor-market needs. There is also widespread local support from educational institutions, government and the general community. She said staff was prepared to find that CSU had met the review criteria established by the Commission and was recommending its authorization.

Ms. Graybill said staff also recommend that CSU provide a timetable for accreditation of the Channel Islands campus by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), a copy of the approved CSU Northridge Ventura Center and CSU Camarillo transition plan, a copy of the fully developed academic plan, and an update report in 2001 on development of the east campus area.

Commissioner Pesqueira cited the staff for good work on the Commission report and said CSU would comply with the requests of the Commission for additional information.

Commissioner Smeby said he appreciated the comment that there would be continuing collaboration between CSU and the independent institutions in the region.

President Evans said this was a long-term collaboration that would continue. He said the campus is unique and invited the commissioners to visit the site.

There was a general discussion about various aspects of developing and planning for the new CSU site. Among the items discussed were the unique nature of retrofitting an existing facility, cooperative steps in academic planning that has included community colleges, measures taken to attract facility with on-site housing, outreach efforts to recruit local students, financing of campus development, and the process of obtaining the necessary local, state, and federal permits. It was noted that CSU had benefited from the experience of establishing other campuses such as Monterey Bay and San Marcos.

Director Fox introduced other CSU officials present. They were Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Dave Spence, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Gary Hammers, and Jim Highsmith, a faculty member at CSU Fresno who chaired the task force on academic planning.

Chair Rodriguez asked about college-going rates in the region, the projection that 90 percent of the Channel Island enrollment is to come from Ventura County, and the impact the proposed campus will have on Tidal Wave II statewide enrollment demand. He asked if the new campus would be pulling new students into higher education or just redirecting students who are or already plan to be enrolled. He said he would like to see more new first-time freshmen introduced to the system. There was a general discussion about the change new facilities might foster in local college-going rates. It was pointed

out that the enrollment projections for the campus were consistent with Commission methodology and had been approved by the Department of Finance.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked about the timeline for completing an agreement with CSU Northridge and the academic master plan. President Evans said the agreement is near completion and that the academic plan discussion will start in January 2001. Vice Chair Arkatov suggested the Commission convene a special teleconference meeting to address final approval of the proposal.

Commission Jhin agreed with the suggestion for an expedited Commission approval and asked for more details about academic planning for the campus. A wide-ranging discussion followed about academic planning to meet the changing economic needs of the region, including a shift from local agriculture, to international agri-business and new technology. There was also a discussion about the capital outlay plans for the facility. Staff expressed confidence in the near-term capital outlay estimates and said the long-range plans had less certainty.

Part-time faculty compensation in California Community Colleges

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Kathleen Chavira to brief the Commission about efforts underway to comply with AB 420.

Ms. Chavira said MGT of America was selected to work with staff on completion of the study called for in this legislation. She introduced Janelle Kubinec, the MGT project coordinator.

Ms. Chavira reviewed the firm's history and experience. She discussed the project timeline, noting that a survey associated with the study had been distributed and that a preliminary report would be presented to the Commission in February 2001, with a report for action in April 2001.

There was a general discussion about part-time employment and compensation in the community colleges, and about the potential financial, collective bargaining, and political issues that surround the topic. Ms. Chavira said the study would include historical information about this issue.

Christopher Cabaldon, California Community College representative, said the Chancellor's office is pleased with the aggressive scheduling of the Commission study. He said many parties are awaiting the results of the Commission's study. He said that the Chancellor's Office believes it would cost from $300 to $500 million dollars to resolve the entire part-time faculty pay disparity issue, but that the community college system had sought more surgical and fundable solutions aimed first at what they believe to be the highest-priority problems. He said the community college Board of Governors is considering both legislative and budget initiatives to address the issues associated with part-time employment issues. He stated that the community colleges are willing to cooperate in the study.

There was a general discussion about the focus, schedule, methodology, and advisory committee composition for the study. It was established that the study is on schedule and that the advisory committee includes many faculty representatives. There was a

conversation about differences among part-time community college staff, including those who teach a full-time load of courses by shuttling from district to district – the so-called "freeway flyers."

In response to possible legislative initiatives that might be sought, Mr. Cabaldon stated that, based upon their data, they estimate that 5 to 10 percent of all part-time community college faculties are freeway flyers teaching full academic loads. He said the issue of compensation for this group is easier to resolve than that of employment security.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked about a response to the recent report by the State Auditor General on the calculation of instructional activity in community colleges.

Mr. Cabaldon said the Auditor's report was correct about enforcement of the 50-percent law and that the Chancellor's is committed to rectifying that. He said another important issue revolves around defining the duties of faculty that appropriately counted as part of instruction. He said the Commission study would address this issue.

There was a discussion about making meaningful comparisons across states of part-time faculty issues.

Mr. Cabaldon said Washington state had looked closely at part-time faculty issues there. He said the Chancellor's office has no major problem with the study's methodology and he does not believe faculty groups will either.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked staff and others for the report and discussion and said this is an important topic.

Student profiles, 2000

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member ZoAnn Laurente to present the Student Profiles 2000 study.

Ms. Laurente said the Student Profiles report compiles much commonly sought student data under one cover and that it frequently served as a foundation for intersegmental discussions about California students. She reviewed the report organization, including changes from prior editions, and provided some highlights of the new report, including the following:

- The annual total of high school graduates is nearly 300, 000, with some 100, 000 completing the A through G sequence of college preparatory course requirements;
- While racial diversity has increased in all sectors of higher education; there has been a marked decline in the proportion of whites and a decrease in the overall number of males;
- The total number of first-time freshmen has increased;
- Community college transfers are up for the fall term at CSU and UC, and up for CSU for the full year, with a steady decrease in lower-division transfer and an increase in upper division transfers; and
- Community college transfer students now represent nearly 31 percent of all students earning a BA degree at UC and over 60 percent at CSU.

Chair Rodriguez stated it is important for this report to be widely disseminated to many different audiences. Vice Chair Arkatov agreed. Ms. Laurente described some of the groups to whom the report is sent. Commissioner Arkatov suggested that the most important aspects the report be identified and flagged. Director Fox said information "gems" would be mined from the data and highlighted throughout the year.

Recess

Committee Chair Chandler recessed the committee meeting at 11:50 for lunch.

Reconvene

The Committee reconvened at 1:10 p.m.

The production and utilization of educational doctorates in California

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Marge Chisholm to present this item.

Ms. Chisholm introduced consultant Bill Furry and Judith Cantrell Harris who have worked on the project. Ms. Chisholm reviewed the study that is called for by AB 1279 (Scott). She described the study scope, the survey conducted, and findings.

Ms. Chisholm said the fundamental policy question is whether the State should adopt policies to foster the production of more doctorates. Based on the study's findings, she said staff had concluded that the production of education doctorates at current levels by institutions of higher education would be sufficient to meet to meet both current demand and that in the foreseeable future. She said several significant, related issued had emerged:

- A low proportion of ethnic minorities now receive doctorates;
- A low proportion of males now receive doctorates; and
- A need may exist for more specialized doctorate programs.

Ms. Chisholm outlined several other issues for consideration. These included the content of the degree, the needs of the community college doctoral candidates, the low incidence of doctoral resources in small school districts, and the link between leadership training and student outcomes.

There was a wide-ranging discussion about several issues raised in the report, including the multiple factors that may effect the supply and demand of doctorates, differences by gender and ethnicity of those receiving doctorates, questions about the value added — for individuals and for the educational process – of the doctorate degree, the present lack of salary and other incentives for persons in education administrative positions to possess or obtain doctorate degrees, and comparisons of California's experience with other states. Among the distinct points made were the following:

- Commissioner Montoya argued that it was inconsistent for the Commission to, on the one hand, find that the present supply of and demand for doctorates in education is in balance, while also recommending that the State encourage individuals from specific groups – such as males and members of certain ethnic groups – to seek a doctorate degree. She said that, given questions about the valued added of the

doctorate, it may be better to encourage individuals to seek types of advanced degrees. She said that officials at institutions that offer doctorates might have a conflict in interest in recommending that there be an increase in the number of doctorate holders in education-related fields. Commissioner Izumi concurred in the final point.

- Vice Chair Arkatov expressed concern about the lack of existing research or studies that examine the educational outcomes – or lack thereof – in relation to the rate of employment of persons that hold doctorates in a given academic environment. He suggested that some private grant resources may be available to do such a study.
- In response to questions from Vice Chair Arkatov, Mr. Furry said one-third of the school districts in the state have a bonus program linked to holding a doctorate degree. Mr. Furry said that, while some bonuses were as high as $3,500 per year, the mean is $1,000. He said this had changed little over time.
- Commissioner Pesqueira stated that the Commission should continue to examine the issues associated with the study and find reason to recommend that California institutions continue to offer and increase the number of doctorate degrees in the state. He expressed disappointment in the report and the focus of the survey. He said many who have earned a doctorate likely found it to be of personal value. There are issues such as availability and affordability of doctorate programs that need to be addressed. He said the current cost of a legitimate doctorate program is from $30,000 to $60,000. He said there are geographic obstacles too. He said there might have been a devaluing of the doctorate in the mind of the general public. He said, while the report provides an accurate picture of the present, it does not take into account future factors that could stimulate demand for doctorate degrees.
- In response to a question about which education sector is the focus of the study's supply and demand assessment, Mr. Furry clarified that the focus is administrators in the K-12 system. He said the assessment of the community college sector was a separate factor. Commissioner Schulze suggested expunging the community college data from the report. Director Fox said some members of the advisory committee suggested and urged the inclusion of community colleges data.

Committee Chair Chandler asked whether joint doctorate programs addressed the affordability.

Julius Zelmanowitz, UC Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives, outlined an initiative between UC Riverside and eight CSU campuses to develop a regional joint doctorate program that has a projected capacity of some 90 education doctorates per year. He said it would appropriately train education leaders for the future. He said UC Berkeley had partnered with three CSU campuses to create a joint doctorate program on urban education leadership. Graduates of the Governor's Principal Institutes may be candidates for such joint doctorate programs he said. There have also been discussions between UC Santa Cruz and CSU San Jose, and between CSU Sacramento and UC Davis. He said he would provide a list for the commissioners.

Commissioner Montoya asked if the Commission could receive an update on the course content of the Governor's Principal Institutes.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked a number of questions about both the methodology of the report and its content. He said the report does not address certain issues, such as cost, associated with the supply side of the equation. He also said there should be an assessment of the value added of education doctorate programs. Commissioner Montoya said the central question is about the content of such programs.

Director Fox thanked all that had worked on the report. He said the final version would be in two parts, with a smaller summary portion and a larger report containing the supporting data. He summarized some of the clarifying edits and changes in the final report, including adding the issue of assessing the policy issues associated with the supply side of the equation.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked all participants and said the item would be discussed again at the December Commission meeting.

Academic program review

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Joan Sallee to present the Academic Program Review item.

Ms. Sallee reviewed the Commission's role in academic program planning, review, and evaluation. She said this report provides only a brief overview and marks a return to regular updates by staff to the Commission about activities in this area.

Ms. Sallee discussed the importance of the Commission's work in this area, outlined the Commission's legislative authority, described the process of review and authority, described the process of review, and noted the criteria used by the Commission staff in reviewing new programs proposed by the community colleges, the State University, and University of California.

A brief discussion followed about the process used by the systems to review existing programs.

Adjournment

Having no further business, Chair Chandler adjourned the committee meeting at 2:33 p.m.

MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of December 11, 2000

Committee members present	Carol Chandler, *Chair* Robert Hanff Lance Izumi Kyo "Paul" Jhin Velma Montoya Howard Welinsky Guillermo Rodriguez, *ex officio* Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*	**Other Commissioners present** Phillip J. Forhan Ralph Pesqueira Evonne Schulze Kyhl Smeby
Committee member absent	Monica Lozano, *Vice Chair*	

Call to order

Committee Chair Chandler called the December 11, 2000 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission Education Policy and Programs Committee to order at 10:16 a.m. in the P.G. and E. Building, Conference Room A, West Lobby, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, California.

Approval of the minutes

Chair Chandler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the committee's October 16, 2000 meeting. A motion was made to adopt the minutes and it was seconded.

In discussing the motion, Commissioner Montoya asserted that a portion of the minutes on page 5 reflecting the discussion about *The Production and Utilization of Educational Doctorates in California* report is misleading and omits what was said during the discussion. Omitted, she said, was the statement that there is no private return to the holder of a doctorate, in that it earns the holder only $1,000. Additionally, there is no public return because there is no evidence of the educational value-added of the doctorate. For those reasons, Commissioner Montoya said she had argued at the October meeting that it did not make sense to support the recommendation that males and ethnic minorities should be encouraged to seek doctorates.

Director Fox said staff could revisit the minutes and bring them back at the next meeting. Committee Chair Chandler also asked that a reference to further discussion of the report reflect the December meeting. Commission Chair Rodriguez recommended that the committee minutes not be addressed at this meeting and he asked that staff review and revise them where necessary, that Commission Montoya provide her recommended corrections in writing, and that staff produce a written transcript of the discussion in ques-

tion. A motion to table the motion to adopt the minutes of October 16 was made, seconded and passed without dissent.

Prospectus for Revisions to the Commission Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Education Centers

Director Fox said Gil Velazquez, a new member of the Commission staff, would present the item.

Mr. Velazquez reviewed the history of the Commission's *Guidelines for the Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Education Centers*. He cited emerging issues that affect the process in establishing a new campus or facility. He said an advisory committee is working with Commission staff and he outlined a time line for revising the guidelines, with a report coming before the Commission in fall 2001. Director Fox commented that, because campus and facility development is moving at a faster pace today, the Commission wants to ensure that its guidelines are reflective of that and enable the Commission to be responsive. He said a number of new proposals are in the pipelines.

Commissioner Pesqueira said it is important to have clear guidelines for collaborative efforts between the community colleges and State Universities or other institutions in order that these efforts can be completed when needed by students. Revising the guidelines will help keep the planning process and balance with the review procedures.

Commissioner Arkatov asked about current trends in planning for upcoming projects. Staff member David Leveille reviewed some innovative designs that involve collaborative efforts between secondary and postsecondary institutions, and those making increased use of technology such as on-line education and distributed learning. He said many of these efforts also involve State government control agencies, such as the Department of Finance.

A Review of California Student Aid Programs and Issues

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Karl Engelbach to review student financial aid programs. He said Wally Boeck, Director of the California Student Aid Commission would speak later in the day about the new Cal Grant Entitlement Program. Mr. Engelbach reviewed the student aid policy principles adopted five years ago by the Commission. He reviewed the federal student financial aid methodology used in California to establish aid eligibility and the amount of aid received by California students.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked about overall financial need among students and expressed concern that many students appear not to know what aid is available. He said there is a need for better marketing to students of information about aid programs, as well as about other programs such as tax credits which benefit students and their families. He urged the Educational Policy and Programs Committee to address the issue of assessing total student financial aid need.

Mr. Engelbach discussed a number of other student financial aid issues and facts, including:

- Tax credits are not considered a form of "student financial aid" but do in fact assist students in meeting college costs;

- The average student loan debt for those University and California State University students taking out student loans about $4,000 per academic year;
- Most state and federal loan-forgiveness programs are targeted at the teaching profession;
- Students and families often take out other loans and make use of credit card debt to pay for education; and
- There is typically a two-year lag in reporting student aid-related data.

Recess

Committee Chair Chandler recessed the meeting at 11:04 a.m.

Reconvene

Committee Chair Chandler reconvened the meeting at 1:28 p.m. She announced that Wally Boeck, Executive Director of the California Student Aid Commission, would make a presentation.

The State Cal Grant Program

Commission staff member Karl Engelbach introduced Mr. Boeck and the topic of changes to State Cal Grant program under the provisions the recently passed SB 1644.

Director Boeck reviewed the history of the four Cal Grant programs -- A, B, C and T -- and their ability to serve eligible applicants. In the past, the State goal had been to provide grants to 25 percent of the graduating high school class. Historically, the California Student Aid Commission has received over one-half million applications, established eligibility for some 135,000 and awarding nearly 78,000 grants.

Director Boeck said that, although it retains the basic residency, application deadline and other requirements, the new Cal Grant program has an entitlement provision. Therefore, all who meet the eligibility requirements and who apply on time will receive a grant. In the new program -- actually subdivided into about 10 programs -- the focus is on recent high school graduates and community college transfer students. There is also a provision for a block of so-called competitive awards for which GPA and other factors are important. He said the Student Aid Commission was in the process of adopting emergency regulations to implement the new program. He said the basic application is federal FAFSA financial aid application. He also explained how the various features of the new programs would work for students receiving awards, including those who might receive community college transfer awards. He said the Commission was hard at work to develop new processing systems to be in place in time for the Cal Grant application deadline. The Student Aid Commission has been at work producing training and communication materials for the revamped programs. He said the goal is to have every graduating high school senior complete a FAFSA. They are also working with the Legislature and control agencies to implement a new work plan and introduce new technology initiatives.

Director Boeck said the Student Aid Commission will increase its workforce by 30 percent and will work with the Postsecondary Education Commission to assess the

outcomes of the new grant program. He believes the coming tidal wave of students is likely to be around 900,000 students over the next decade.

Commissioner Pesqueira asked about the Cal Grant residency requirement as it might apply in the case of a student — whose parents are legal residents — who are termed illegal residents due to lack of paperwork for the student. Mr. Boeck said that, although this is an issue for the State to address, SB 1644 does not cover such students.

In response to a question from Commissioner Welinsky, Mr. Boeck said the Cal Grant program would award $503 million this year, $622 million in 2001, and some $1.2 billion in 2005-06. He said it is estimated that it could reach $2 billion by 2006-07, but there are many variables. In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, he said a disability is a factor in the awarding of the competitive portion of the program.

Director Fox said that Mr. Boeck had met with staff to discuss evaluating the new grant program.

The Production and Utilization of Educational Doctorates in California

Committee Chair Chandler called upon staff member Marge Chisholm to present this action item.

Director Fox said Chair Rodriguez had asked him to review prior activities associated with this report. He reviewed the enabling legislation, AB 1279, and the steps staff had taken in hiring a consultant and establishing an advisory group to produce the first draft which had been reviewed at the October meeting in Fresno. He said additional material had been gathered together into "Working Papers" related to the research done in producing the report.

Committee Chair Chandler said that, following the staff presentation, Commissioners could first ask questions and then members of the public could speak. She asked those who wanted to make public comment to complete a "Speaker's Request" form.

Ms. Chisholm said the current draft had been revised in light of the comments made about the first draft. She reviewed the structure of the report. She said Chapter Two had been reformatted and included the report's primary findings and other issues that had emerged during discussions. It was clarified that the report's focus is on K-12. Two new issues of concern have been added: (1) there should be an examination of the need for more holders of doctorates in the four-year institutions, and (2) because two-thirds of the doctorates are produced by independent institutions, levels of the State investment in such programs at public universities might be explored.

Ms. Chisholm said the Commission concludes that, based on estimated supply and demand over the next decade, California will be able to maintain the present percentage of public school administrators who have doctorates. She thanked the postsecondary education representatives for their help in producing the report. She also said no one had questioned the integrity of the research methodology or data that supported the findings. She said some additional changes would be made before the report is circulated, including placing the primary finding in italics. She said the "Working Papers" are an official part of the work and will be available.

Commission Chair Rodriguez said the Commission had been very inclusive in the consultation process for this report, that staff had been responsive to input from the Commission as it reviewed prior drafts, and the current draft reflects this. As a result of the consultation process with all stakeholders, he said the report's contents should not catch anyone by surprise. He moved adoption of the report with the changes Ms. Chisholm had outlined to the committee. The motion was seconded and Committee Chair Chandler asked if there was any discussion.

Commissioner Montoya stated that she had an alternate motion and passed out copies to Commissioners. She said the report had been altered to hide the main conclusion and that she had documentation of that fact and passed out a sheet of paper to members of the Commission. She then read from the October 16 draft of the report: "Production of education doctorates by institutions of higher education is sufficient to provide the supply necessary to meet the demand now and in the foreseeable future by public school districts, whether this demand is expressed in absolute numbers or as a percentage of administrators. Little evidence was found to suggest rising demand by public school districts for education doctorates." She said she was unaware of why the reference to the "foreseeable future" was dropped from the current draft of the report.

Chair Rodriguez said that staff had in the report taken a "snapshot" in assessing the present supply and demand for education doctorates. Commission discussion had reflected the belief that the data did not support the contention that circumstances in the future would not or could not change – such as making a doctorate more affordable – and, therefore, the demand for doctorates would not change. He said he and other commissioners had not been comfortable with this contention and had advocated at the October meeting that the references to the future demand for doctorates be dropped and that the current draft reflected this.

Commissioner Montoya said she respectfully disagreed. She said the reason for the legislation behind the report was to plan for the future as regards education doctorates. The report had said the supply and demand for doctorates was in balance now and for the foreseeable future.

Committee Chair Chandler raised a point of procedure. She said the motion on the table was by the Commission Chair to approve the current draft of the report. She said there was now discussion on that motion. Referring to the piece of paper Commissioner Montoya had passed out, Committee Chair Chandler asked if Commissioner Montoya wanted to make an alternate motion. Commissioner Montoya responded affirmatively and the motion was seconded. (Commissioner Montoya's motion was passed out to the Commissioners but was not read into the record.) The text of the handed out motion is as follows:

> **That the language in Section 2, Page 5, under the heading "Findings Based on Study Results" be amended as follows** (additions identified by underline; deletions by strike-out):
>
> Based on estimated supply and demand over the next decade, the Commission concludes that California will be able to maintain the current percentage

of public school administrators who hold a doctorate. *Production of education doctorates by institutions of higher education is sufficient to provide the supply necessary to meet demand now and in the foreseeable future by public school and community college districts, whether this demand is expressed in absolute numbers or as a percentage of administrators. Little evidence was found to suggest rising demand by public school districts for education doctorates. New state initiatives will not be necessary to achieve this percentage.* The number of doctorates in administrative positions has remained roughly constant over the last 10 years (rising from 2,122 to 2,184), with California universities having produced approximately 450 doctorates per year. The stable number of doctorates employed is consistent with a retirement rate of about 100 doctorates per year and a rate of employment of new doctorates in the public schools of about 110 per year.

However, this Commission report, despite its narrow focus on supply of and demand for doctorates in public education, suggests a need for a larger public-policy perspective related to the various aspects of doctoral education in California. ~~Although overall~~ Overall production of education doctorates is sufficient to accommodate existing and future demand for doctorates in the State's public schools, if current levels of employment are accepted. However, a number of other important issues emerged that merit serious consideration.

Commissioners Pesqueira and Schulze argued against the second motion. Commissioner Welinsky said the Commission should address the issue of future demand and spoke in favor of Commissioner Montoya's motion. Commissioner Wilson commented that the legislation had calls for an assessment of the present and future demand for doctorates in education. She said the report should reflect that and asked that both motions be looked at in light of this fact.

Commissioner Montoya asked the Committee Chair if Julius Zelmanowitz from the University of California could speak to the Commission and Chair Chandler agreed.

Commissioner Pesqueira questioned whether non-commissioners could be heard during the discussion period of a motion. Executive Director Fox said it had been the practice of the Commission to take public comment on important matters and it was more a question of the Commission wanted to proceed and in what order speakers would be heard.

Commissioner Chandler asked if any other Commissioner wished to speak or comment.

Vice Chair Arkatov asked the prior comments of other commissioners be addressed first.

Chair Rodriguez expressed agreement with commissioners Welinsky and Wilson concerning the legislations call to address the future demand for doctorates. He said he was open to suggestions that could incorporate the Commission's concern that future demand for doctorates could change if provisions for obtaining a doctorate changed as

well. He said that, if doctorate programs became more accessible, affordable and tailored to subject matter needs, then demand would likely go up. He said the requirement for school administrative candidates to have an education doctorate would likely go up as well if the pool of such applicants were expanded.

Commissioner Pesqueira said expanding collaboration between the community colleges and State University system could stimulate demand for education doctorates in the future and this had not been addressed in the report.

Ms. Chisholm said the October report language was accurate at that time – saying that, all other things being equal and if nothing changes, the State has an adequate supply to meet the demand for doctorate holders in education — but that the new draft reflects the Commission's subsequent discussion about potential changing conditions in the future. Commissioner Montoya asked why the report does not say that.

Commissioner Schulze said things change all the time and she advocated language that reflects that. Commissioner Montoya advocating adding the words, "all other things being equal."

Commissioner Chandler asked where in the report it is appropriate to address potential changing conditions. Director Fox pointed out that the report and working papers had many pages addressing the details of supply and demand. Commissioner Schulze said she was not comfortable with any finding that said or implied that the state already has enough education.

Commissioner Wilson said the Commission needed to be responsive to legislation that called for an assessment of the future need for doctorates. Commissioner Welinsky argued in favor of making a clear assessment about the future need for doctorates. Commissioner Jhin pointed out the portion of the report that compares California with other states in terms of education administrators who hold a doctorate. He said it shows that California is behind others by this measure.

Commissioner Pesqueira spoke in favor of the first motion saying it reflected the point of view that we need to continue to examine the issues around supply and demand for doctorates in education; that it would remain an open issue. He said he feared a reaction now that would be similar to that of 1960 when these issues were addressed.

Commissioner Forhan said the community colleges need more personnel who hold a doctorate degree and that there was a specific need for more ethnic minority personnel to have doctorates. In terms of diversity, he said the status quo of supply and demand for doctorates is not adequate even today; the situation needs to be improved.

Commissioner Smeby asked that references in the report that refer to "private" institutions be changed to "independent" institutions.

Chair Rodriguez said he did not believe the two motions were that far apart.

Commissioner Montoya again suggested adding the words, "all things being equal" and also adding a date certain in place of the term "foreseeable" in reference to the future.

Committee Chair Chandler opened the floor to public comment on the substitute motion.

Julius Zelmanowitz spoke in favor of the substitute motion. In response to a question from Chair Rodriguez, he said he did not know if California needed and more holders of an education doctorate. He said the report called for research to learn if the kind of doctorate training being offered currently makes a difference to the quality of K-12 education. He said he agreed with Commissioner Schulze that more education and more doctorates are better for society.

Chair Rodriguez asked if the substitute would not foreclose offering more doctorates.

Mr. Zelmanowitz said it did not. He said the evidence in the report should not be ignored. He said that the supply for doctorates in education could increase by changing the proportion of all doctorates that enter education. He said there is significant ethnic diversity among the students enrolled in doctorates at the University of California and independent institutions. This is a classic economic study of supply and demand. In such a study, he said economic incentives are one measure of increased demand. He said an indicator that demand was not increasing was to be found in the report's finding that $1,000 is the median stipend offered for education administrators who hold a doctorate, and that this rate had been steady and was not rising. He said the finding should modified to say: "Under current policies, the production of education doctorates by institutions of higher education is sufficient to provide the supply necessary …." He said this would make clear that the Commission was referring to the current policies and not those it might recommend for the future.

Commissioner Chandler asked Bill Wilson, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at CSU, to speak.

Mr. Wilson spoke against the substitute motion. He said it implied that current policy about doctorate education is acceptable. He said that access by ethnic minority candidates to affordable, public doctoral programs is an important policy consideration. He said the report had not surveyed potential candidates for doctoral programs but he believed more demand would be found by so doing. There is a need for a larger public policy on this issue.

Commissioner Montoya asked Mr. Wilson if he read the study and he replied affirmatively.

Christopher Cabaldon, representing the California Community Colleges, urged caution in the manner in which the report's findings are portrayed. He said the report accurately reflects the state of ambiguity that exists presently about the doctorate and other academic degrees. Terms such as percentage, demand and need are not interchangeable. He said the term need goes to issues like geographic access, in-service training and content. He said there is much discussion about these programs and degrees and it has re-awakened interest in innovation in programs that have atrophied in recent years. He said there was a need between future needs and potential needs for doctorates. The latter raises the question of whether the programs will be redefined to meet future needs.

Commissioner Montoya said she did not disagree with the comments about potentially enriching doctoral programs but that her motion spoke to the findings of the study.

Commissioner Schulze asked, with all due respect, if the real issue was that the University of California does not want the California State University to issue doctorates. She said the legislature is owed a report of substance.

Commissioner Wilson proposed dropping both motions and drafting a third finding that would give the Legislature a finding that can be acted upon.

Chair Rodriguez read the finding on page five of the report and said it addressed the concerns of Commissioners Welinsky and Wilson. Commissioner Wilson said the report could do a better job stating what the facts are in addressing the issue of need. She said this would give the Legislature food for thought on where the State ought to go with doctoral programs. Chair Rodriguez said the total report does address many of these concerns already and calls for additional study.

Juan Yniguez Senior Vice President of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities said staff had been made aware of some editorial changes AICCU believes necessary.

George Kurtz spoke in favor of adhering to the provisions of the California Master Plan for Higher Education of 1960 and its provision for having doctorates awarded by the University of California, and for joint doctorate programs to be offered by UC in conjunction with the State University. He said the State University wanted to change this and offer independent doctorate programs. He did not favor such a change.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked him for his comments.

Commissioner Montoya said her substitute motion better represented the findings of the report. She said it was not drafted to address the issue of which system offers doctorates and that she took personal umbrage at that implication. She withdrew her substitute motion. The second to that motion was also withdrawn.

Commission Chair Rodriguez asked staff to read a revised finding for consideration as part of his motion.

Ms. Chisholm read: "Based on estimated supply and demand over the next decade, and if current levels of employment are accepted, the Commission concludes that California will be able to maintain the current percentage of public school administrators who hold a doctorate and provide sufficient doctorates for existing and future demand."

Recess

Committee Chair Chandler recessed the meeting at 3:22 p.m. in order for staff to draft additional language for consideration.

Reconvene

Committee Chair Chandler reconvened the meeting at 3:32. p.m.

Vice Chair Arkatov noted that the day's debate demonstrated that the segments have very spirited points of view. He said the recommendation was to stay with the original motion Chair Rodriguez had put on the floor. He called for a vote.

Commissioner Schulze asked to hear from staff. Ms. Chisholm read a sentence that could be added to the finding on page 5: following the first sentence, "However, changes in potential needs of the California Community Colleges and the public education sector could lead to the need for production of additional degrees."

Chair Rodriguez said the original motion was the only motion on the floor. Commissioner Schulze called the question. Committee Chair Chandler asked for a voice vote. The motion passed, with Commissioner Montoya abstaining.

Adjournment

Chair Chandler thanked the Commissioners and staff for their work on the report. Having no further business, she adjourned the committee meeting at 3:34 p.m.