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The Santa Barbara Community College District is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the 1977-82 Five-Year Plan for the California Community Colleges.

Our response is a summary of trustee and staff comments. It has been reviewed and adopted by the Board of Trustees.

We believe the statement of philosophy is strongly supportive of the community college concept. We appreciate efforts of the Board of Governors to support and implement their statement of philosophy.

We believe that the present document is a good statement of the major concerns before us; however, it is more a listing of issues than it is a plan. As the plan becomes more specific, we hope that the Board of Governors will continue to recognize the unique resource that is the local trustee. We anticipate that the Board of Governors will support firmly and vigorously its philosophy of "maintaining and continuing to the maximum degree permissible local autonomy and control in the administration of the community colleges."

We all have much to do if we are to become as efficient and as effective as the need requires. We would like to be as helpful as possible in this effort. We urge that there be early attention to development of a more precise understanding of the roles of the Board of Governors and the local Boards of Trustees.
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Part A Issues

1977-82 Five Year Plan

Chapter III. Access and Diversity (p.11)

1) Flexible Calendar (p.15)
2) Mastery Learning (p.15)
3) Curriculum Balance (p.16)
4) Program Development (p.17)
5) Essential Skills (p.17)
6) Students not Traditionally Served (p.18)
7) Student Personnel Services (p.21)
8) Evaluating Student Performance (p.22)

Chapter IV. Management (p.24)

9) Governance (p.25)
10) Legislation (p.26)
11) Information (p.27)
12) Measuring Student Progress (p.27)
13) Evaluation of College Operations (p.28)
14) Intergovernmental Coordination (p.29)

Chapter V. Resources

15) Collective Bargaining (p.33)
16) Part-Time Faculty (p.33)
17) Staff Development (p.34)
18) Instructional Technologies (p.34)
19) Optimum Size of Operations (p.35)
20) Off-Campus Operations (p.36)

Chapter VI. Finance

21) Operating Budgets (p.40)
22) Capital Outlay (p.41)
23) Student Charges (p.42)
24) Financial Aid (p.43)

Comments:

* See attached comments

Recommended Solution

Is the resolution of this issue as proposed in the Board's 1977-82 Five Year Plan appropriate? (If not, please comment below)

* A value of "5" indicates that a high priority should be assigned to that item, and a value of "1" indicates a low priority. For example, a high priority "5" indicates you feel the problem is important and should be addressed this year. In contrast, a "3" could indicate an important, but less urgent problem that could be addressed at a later date. The lowest priority, "1" indicates the problems defining this issue are not important and, in any event, could await solution until later in the five years.

(Over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested New Issues</th>
<th>Importance of Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact of State mandates on local operations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic standards for entrance, progress, and completion</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. District compliance with State laws and regulations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of learning resources such as television, computers, audio-tutorials, programmed learning, etc. in the instructional process</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact on colleges increasing federal requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implications of increasing numbers of career changes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Desirability of 50% law</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Use of community service funds</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Articulation of student's into four year institutions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Need for changes to existing district organization</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Need for changes interdistrict attendance provisions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Need for more accurate attendance/enrollment accounting</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Impact of stable or declining enrollments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Role of Community Colleges in energy, water, or other resource conservation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Desirability of credentials</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Development and operation of bilingual programs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Appropriate level of beginning district budget balances</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What others do you suggest?

18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
Chapter III. ACCESS AND DIVERSITY (p. 11)

(1) **Flexible Calendar** (p. 15)

This concept should have a high priority (5). The present experiment is much too restrictive. The long-range solution must be found in the manner in which attendance and work-load are computed, reported, and reimbursed.

(2) **Mastery Learning** (p. 15)

This concept is important (4). The solution, as indicated, is greater flexibility.

(3) **Curriculum Balance** (p. 16)

This concept is of high importance at the local level (5). In this area, particularly, decisions regarding balance must be left to the local districts. It is not feasible to be as responsive to the needs of students at the state level as it is at the local level. Care must be exerted even in state direction of regional and inter-district curriculum planning.

(4) **Program Development** (p. 17)

This concept is of high importance (4). The districts do not need direction on how or when to develop programs nearly as much as they need reliable information on the criteria mentioned. That is the area in which the Board of Governors can be most helpful.

(5) **Essential Skills** (p. 17)

This is an area of highest priority (5). The BOG plan to serve as a resource is sound. It is essential, however, that the State not mandate specific procedures and standardized approaches. This problem can be solved only by community college faculties. Opportunity for diversity in their approaches and adequate support are required.
This is an area of highest priority (5). Emphasis in the BOG Five-Year Plan is placed upon the "non-traditional" student and assessment of their needs. This is appropriate as far as it goes. The colleges, however, need greater flexibility, not standardization, in procedures and techniques for meeting the needs of non-traditional students. This requires non-traditional approaches and services. With adequate opportunity to be responsive and with adequate support, the colleges can and will be responsive.

EOPS should be an integrated effort cooperating with other Student Services programs and with Instructional Services in providing for the needs of students. It does not, however, duplicate effort and, therefore, should not be perceived as a "microcosm of all student personnel services." Such perceptions tend to lead some to believe that EOPS should serve as a model to other student services programs. In 1977 (as compared with 5-8 years ago) this concept may not be valid. Were such to be the case, the cost to the district and the State would be overwhelming. The inference that EOPS sets the pace may be misleading, since EOPS actually derives a great deal of its success from other existing Student Services support.

This is a matter of high priority (4). The statement in the Five-Year Plan and present activities at the state level are of concern to the Santa Barbara Community College District.

We believe deeply that it will not be of assistance to our students to be required to prepare and submit an annual plan and
to function in accordance with any state-wide plan for student personnel services.

The colleges need resources if they are to provide improved student personnel services. This requires recognition of the need in the funding process. It requires that there be no imposition of student fees for this purpose. It requires elimination or re-definition of the 50 percent law. It requires an understanding at the state level that as enrollments level off or decrease and as the fiscal situation worsens, colleges will be forced to provide fewer student support services, not more, unless there is recognition of the situation and financial help from the State.

If categorical funding for student services becomes a reality, it is hoped that funds will be provided on a per student basis (ADA or WSCH) rather than on a report basis (similar to EOPS). Otherwise state-wide procedures are likely which cannot be as responsive to local situations and needs.

(8) Evaluating Student Performance (p. 22)

This is an issue of only average or low priority (2). "Grade inflation" at the community colleges cannot be considered separately from "grade inflation" in all of postsecondary education. Grading standards are not precise. They fluctuate with social movements. As indicated in the Five-Year Plan, a reversal has occurred in the trend, already.

Greater standardization in the meaning of grades will be helpful if it can be achieved.

What is needed most, however, is support and assistance in determining the outcomes of education. It would be useful if the BOG could assist colleges and districts to develop and implement more precise ways to measure learning or the outcomes of education.
Chapter IV. MANAGEMENT (p. 24)

(9) Governance (p. 25)

This is an issue of high priority (4). Hopefully, the Board of Governors will see that there is greater waste of effort and greater expense in state-wide actions to eliminate duplication than there is in the duplication among the institutions which state-wide efforts are intended to eliminate.

Hopefully, the BOG will see that it may best serve the interests of the public and of community college students by becoming a strong voice for the community colleges with the other segments and with other State agencies. Coordination and direction of the community colleges are appropriate functions of the BOG, but the existence of local governing boards is unique to the community colleges among postsecondary education in California. Hopefully, the Board of Governors understands and appreciates this unique resource.

Hopefully, the Board will exert its greatest efforts in being a strong supportive voice for community colleges in dealing with the other segments and in clarifying its role in cooperation with other State agencies.

(10) Information (p. 27)

Provision of adequate and accurate data is a significant need (5).

Standardization and simplification of report forms and data requests are urgently needed.

(12) Measuring Student Progress (p. 27)

This is an item of moderate importance (priority 3). This is related to the general need for adequate, accurate, comparable data.
(13) **Evaluation of College Operations** (p. 28)

This is a matter of high priority at the local level but should be of lower priority at the state level (3).

The Santa Barbara Community College District appreciates the fact that the Board of Governors opposes accreditation of community colleges by a public agency. There are two great values in this approach. First, accreditation currently is voluntary, and it is introspective. It is a professional responsibility that should be acknowledged and accepted by professional educators. Second, it provides a vehicle for evaluation that is separate from and in addition to that of public agencies. Hopefully, the Board of Governors will successfully resist efforts to make accreditation a governmental function.

(14) **Intergovernmental Coordination** (p. 29)

This is a matter of high priority (4). Hopefully, some procedure will be found to make this possible. If this is left to the individual colleges or districts, equity among the colleges and districts cannot be achieved.

Chapter V. **RESOURCES**

(15) **Collective Bargaining** (p. 33)

This is a matter of very low priority at the state level (1).

(16) **Part-Time Faculty** (p. 33)

This is a matter of the highest priority (5). Here the Board of Governors faces the most divisive issue of the time. It is not possible to be responsive to the variety of concerns and interests which are involved.

Hopefully, the Board of Governors will focus on the interests of the public on this issue rather than on those of any element of the community college constituency.
That focus, it is believed, will result in Board policies and legislation which provide maximum flexibility in staffing so the colleges can adapt to changing curriculum needs and to changing financial situations. Hopefully, the Board also will accept and support the view that part-time faculty do not and should not have the same responsibilities nor the same salary as full-time regular faculty members.

(17) **Staff Development** (p. 34)

This is a matter of high priority (4). The Five-Year Plan statement is not really a plan. A plan should be developed. It should provide incentives and resources.

(18) **Instructional Technologies** (p. 34)

This is a matter of moderate urgency (priority 3). Community college faculties will develop the new technology as the need and opportunities arise.

(19) **Optimum Size of Operations** (p. 35)

This is an issue of medium priority (3). It is virtually impossible at the state level to generalize about optimum college size in 70 community college districts. Criteria such as access, service, and efficiency should be applied.

(20) **Off-Campus Operations** (p. 36)

This is of importance (priority 4). Quality of learning and cost effectiveness must be safeguarded, but it seems apparent that off-campus centers should be encouraged if access and diversity are to be maximized.

Chapter VI. FINANCE

(21) **Operating Budgets** (p. 40)

This is a matter of high priority (5). This is an accurate statement of need, but it is not a plan. Hopefully, the Board of
Governors will develop specific plans for stabilizing and improving finance procedures. It is extremely difficult to plan in any meaningful way when funding procedures and levels are changed as frequently as has been the case.

(22) **Capital Outlay** (p. 41)

This is a matter of high priority (5). Unfortunately, this college district believes that actions of the Board of Governors have been detrimental in generating State support for capital outlay. Because of delays and, even, opposition to bond issues by the BOG, no solid base was built for State support. The colleges are now suffering and costs are escalating. Hopefully, the Board of Governors will be forceful and persuasive in seeking State support for capital outlay in the future.

(23) **Student Charges** (p. 42)

The Board's re-affirmation of the tuition-free policy is gratifying, but it is hoped that the Board will take a more firm and supportive position on this concept.

The Board's position and goals on access and diversity appear to be strong and firm. An equally firm position is required on the issue of student charges if the Board's goals on access are to be achieved.

(24) **Financial Aid** (p. 43)

This is an issue of high priority (4). The Board's position is strong and supportive and recognizes the necessity for local packaging and administration of financial aids.
Part B

Philosophy and Goals

The Board of Governors' statement of philosophy and goals is attached. This statement is intended to define a timeless and unconstrained (either politically or economically) statement of the fundamental mission of the California Community Colleges.

In your opinion:

Is this an appropriate statement of

A) Philosophy
   Yes [X] No [ ]
B) Goals
   [X] [ ]

If not, why not?

Philosophy

Comments:

Suggested changes:

Goals

Comments:

Suggested changes: