DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 301 HE 021 168

AUTHOR Pickens, William H.
TITLE The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education through the Year 2000.
INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO CPEC-87-39
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 15p.; A presentation to the California Joint Legislature Budget Committee on October 14, 1987.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Capital Outlay (for Fixed Assets); Community Colleges; Construction Costs; *Cost Estimates; *Facility Improvement; *Higher Education; Private Financial Support; State Aid; *State Colleges; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *California; California Community Colleges; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

This report looks at the infrastructure (capital outlay) needs of higher education in California through the Year 2000, indicating the needs projected by segment (University of California, California State University, and community colleges); past funding; and options for accommodating increasing enrollments and meeting capital outlay needs. Estimates are close to $7.7 billion for capital construction, renovation, and repairs through the Year 2000, due to 12 years of funding instability, the increased demand for new facilities with the recent types of enrollment growth, and construction, renovation, and equipment funding of segmented offices. Without these funds, segments may not be able to handle all eligible students, instruction quality could decline, there may be health and safety problems, and the enormous state investment in the 135 public campuses may be threatened. The State needs to use many funding sources and options in order to meet the minimal infrastructure needs of higher education. Options include issues related to: increased utilization standards for classrooms and laboratories; year-round operations; expanded use of technology; use of off-campus centers; greater use of the independent sector; tax incentives for private contributions to capital projects; general fund support for maintenance of non-state funded space; encouraging lower-division students to attend the community colleges; and bond funding. The legislature must decide which methods to use to make private donations for various facilities more attractive to the institutions and the donors. (SM)

Summary

William H. Pickens, executive director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, presented this testimony to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee of the California Legislature at its meeting in Sacramento on October 14, 1987.

In the paper, Mr. Pickens reports that California's three segments of public higher education -- the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges -- estimate that they will need $7.7 billion through the remaining dozen years of this century for capital construction, renovation,and repairs to their facilities -- compared to only $1.7 billion they have received for this purpose during the most recent dozen years.

On pages 1-2, Mr. Pickens provides details about these estimates and explains the reasons for their magnitude. On pages 3-4, he indicates the likely consequences of insufficient funding for capital expenditures through the year 2000. On pages 4-6, he discusses nine options for providing adequate funds during that period. And on page 6, he concludes that "if even the minimal infrastructure needs of higher education are to be met, it appears that General Obligation bonds will be required," and he recommends three specific ways by which the Legislature can help meet these needs over the next decade.

Additional copies of this paper may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the report may be addressed to Mr. Pickens at (916) 445-1000.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH THE YEAR 2000

A Presentation to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on October 14, 1987, by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 87-39
PUBLISHED OCTOBER 1987

Contents

The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education Through the Year 2000

MR. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to thank you for inviting me to discuss the infrastructure or capital outlay needs of California higher education up to and including the year 2000. You asked me to indicate (1) these needs as identified by the institutions of higher education, (2) their projected costs, and (3) some options for meeting them, and I will do so in that sequence.

Capital needs projected by the segments

The three public segments of higher education have provided us with general estimates of their infrastructure needs over the next 12 years. For capital construction, renovation, and repairs, their estimates total nearly $7.7 billion. That compares with actual expenditures over the preceding 12 years of less than $1.7 billion (Display 1, below).

DISPLAY 1 Total State and Local Capital Outlay Expenditures (Excluding Federal and Non-State Funds) at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, 1976-77 to 1987-88, and Total Estimated Need, 1988-89 to 1999-2000, in Millions of Dollars

Year	University of California	The California State University	California Community Colleges	Total[1]
1976-77	$53.9	$29.2	$68.4	$151 5
1977-78	36.8	34.2	74.8	145 8
1978-79	46.2	23.8	28.9	98.9
1979-80	20.4	16.5	15.6	52 5
1980-81	39.3	21.3	18.1	78 7
1981-82	12.0	16.9	5 6	34 5
1982-83	13.5	11.8	10.6	35 9
1983-84	7 1	10.1	10 8	28 0
1984-85	139.0	18.1	7.2	164 3
1985-86	141.7	26.0	48.8	216 5
1986-87 (Estimated)	162.8	146.7	42.9	352.4
1987-88 (Estimated)	140 4	106.2	50.3	296.9
Total Expenditures, 1976-77 to 1987-88	$813.1	$460.8	$382.0	$1,655.9
Total Estimated Need, 1988-89 to 1999-2000	$3,600.0[2]	$3,300.0	$780.0	$7,680.0

1. Numbers in the first three columns do not always add to the total due to rounding.
2. Using the University's higher estimate of $300 million per year.

Source: 1976-1988 data. Governor's Budget, 1978-79 through 1987 88. 1988-2000 estimate: Segmental calculations of need.

University of California

The University of California estimates a total capital outlay budget need of between $200 and $300 million each year through the year 2000. At the $300 million level, $100 million would be allocated for renovation and remodeling of existing facilities, $130 million for new buildings to accommodate both expanding enrollments and the need for additional research space, and $70 million for such needs as roads, utilities, and safety measures like seismic corrections and asbestos removal. The total need projected by the University thus becomes somewhere near $3.6 billion, compared to actual capital outlay expenditures for the last 12 years of $0 8 billion

The California State University

The California State University currently projects a need of $1.253 billion in its current five-year capital outlay budget 1988-89 through 1992-93, and a similar amount for the succeeding five years. To this, the State University estimates a ten-year need of $145 million for repairing roofs, boilers, and related repairs plus an additional $100 million for utilities repairs. Assuming that rate continues through 1999 and 2000, the total capital requirement becomes $3.3 billion, compared to actual expenditures over the last 12 years of $460 million. The State University estimates that about 25 to 30 percent of this amount will be required for the renovation of existing facilities, with the remainder for new facilities to accommodate increasing enrollments. In addition, $125 million or more could be required if one or more of its permanent centers in San Diego, Contra Costa, or Ventura Counties develop into full-fledged, four-year campuses.

California Community Colleges

The California Community Colleges were able to provide only rough estimates of their capital requirements at $65 million per year, with no estimate for maintenance. The 12-year total is therefore $780 million, compared to expenditures over the past 12 years of $382 million. The Chancellor's Office cannot break this down into new construction and remodeling/renovation.

Why so much?

The first question is: Why are these estimates so high, especially when compared to the last 12 years of spending? There are three general answers.

- First, the last 12 years have been a period of funding instability, caused by Proposition 13 and by the recession in the early 1980s. For several years, you were forced to take funds that are usually reserved for capital outlay and shift them to General Fund support expenditures. Thus, many priority projects were deferred and the needs are now becoming critical.
- Second, the 1970s represented a period of enrollment stability for the University and State University, while enrollment in the Community Colleges grew rapidly. However, during the 1980s the two four-year institutions have grown rapidly -- by 12.7 percent at the University and 6.6 percent at the State University -- while, on the other hand, statewide Community College enrollment has declined. Capital outlay requirements are not exclusively enrollment-driven, since facilities need to be renovated and repaired even in periods of enrollment decline. However, demand for new facilities is increased with the kind of growth in enrollments experienced recently, and estimates from the segments and the Department of Finance are that enrollments in the two public university systems will grow between 14,000 to 36,000 in the next 12 years.
- Third and finally, the segments will be requesting, and will need, several billion dollars worth of construction, renovation, and equipment funding over the next 12 years, even if enrollment increases are at the low end, as predicted by the Department of Finance. The segmental offices have given us general estimates that even if enrollment does not grow at all, approximately $4 to $5 billion for routine maintenance and repairs will still be required, with approximately a fourth to a third of the $7.7 billion -- about $2.3 billion -- projected to be required for capital outlay devoted to renovation or conversion of existing buildings, and alterations to meet seismic, asbestos, and other safety standards.

I also want to reflect a moment on the reliability of these gross estimates of capital outlay requirements and their general utility for planning purposes. Let

me say briefly that I think they are reasonable only for *very general* budget planning purposes, to allow you to anticipate the broad policy and funding decisions that you will need to make in the next few years. They are not good for much more than that, for several reasons.

- First, the State does not generally ask the segments to provide reliable figures for capital outlay needs beyond the next five years, so their development involves much guesswork.
- Second, the basic planning tool that we use is long-range enrollment projections developed by the Department of Finance, and these figures have historically had little real predictability with respect to capital outlay expenditure requirements into the distant future. For example, Display 2 below indicates that the Department's 1977 projections for California's 1985 adult population proved low by between 9 and 13 percent for those age groups most likely to enroll in college.
- Finally, we have to rely on the estimates developed by the segments themselves, which vary in quality and sophistication. Some of the disparity between the aggregate need figures for the three public segments is caused by differences in funding requirements among them that are real and that relate to the age and the use of the facility. For instance, the University of California should be expected to have high projected need relative to their size because much of its physical plant is quite old, as well as because of its basic mission for doctoral instruction and research. The physical plant requirements for some of its research areas with emerging technologies are extremely sophisticated, often with comprehensive health and safety needs, and they simply cost more than general-purpose instructional space. The University also is close to capacity in many of its instructional and research areas, whereas some Community Colleges have excess capacity at this time. However, we are concerned that one of the reasons we have such relatively low cost estimates for the Community College system at this time is that the Chancellor's Office does not have the capacity to come up with better cost estimates. Currently that system has neither a reliable facilities inventory nor the capacity to project enrollments and relate these projections to capital outlay needs. As a policy matter, we are concerned that some steps need to be taken to ensure reasonable parity among the segments in their ability to identify and project their funding needs.

What will happen if funds are not available?

If capital outlay appropriations sufficient to remodel and maintain the existing plant, as well as to provide new construction, are not forthcoming over the next 12 years, it is likely that the segments will experience several negative consequences:

- They may not be able to accommodate all quali-

DISPLAY 2 *California Population Projected in 1977 for 1980 and 1985 and Reported in 1986, by Various Age Groups*

	Population Projected in 1977 for 1980 and 1985		Population Reported in 1986 for 1980 and 1985		Percentage Difference	
Age Group	1980	1985	1980	1985	1980	1985
15 to 19	2,018,360	1,803,309	2,140,382	1,965,565	6.1	9.0
20 to 34	6,008,315	6,288,537	6,629,119	7,121,705	10.3	13.3

Source: California State Department of Finance Reports No. 77-P-3 and 86-P-3.

fied students, particularly those eligible to attend the University and the State University.

- Their quality and relevance of instruction will decline if adequate facilities are not provided. This could be particularly serious in the sciences and engineering, where the rapidity of technological change necessitates the availability of modern facilities.
- They could suffer increasing health and safety problems, particularly on the older campuses.
- The State's enormous investment in its 135 public campuses will be in jeopardy.

Past funding of capital outlay

California has funded its capital needs in a variety of ways, including the General Fund, tidelands oil revenues, general obligation bonds. revenue bonds, and private fund raising, the last being used primarily for non-academic space. Throughout the 1960s, general obligation bonds were used extensively until a major bond issue was defeated in 1968. Then, although voters approved a major health sciences bond issue in 1972, they defeated a $150 million Construction Bond Act for the Community Colleges in 1976, and Proposition 13 forced the State to assume the responsibility for capital outlay in the two-year colleges with the elimination of a special property tax for capital outlay that each district could levy to provide its portion of construction projects. Accordingly, in the 1970s, the primary source of funding became the State's tidelands oil revenues -- the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education (COFPHE) -- but this source began to decline late in the decade. By 1983-84, State-funded capital outlay had been reduced to minimal levels.

One alternative to both tidelands revenue and general obligation bond financing was initiated in 1983 with the passage of Chapter 1268, the High Technology Revenue Bond Act. This act permitted the Public Works Board to issue revenue bonds and various kinds of negotiable notes for the construction of research and educational facilities in engineering, computer science, and related biological and physical sciences. The Board then enters into a lease-purchase arrangement with the institutions of higher education, which pay for the leases with appropriations from the State's General Fund. Other kinds of revenue bonds involve the more traditional kind in higher education that are instruments secured by a dedicated income stream for repayment such as parking lots, dormitories, bookstores, and other revenue generating facilities.

Faced with having virtually no funds for higher education capital outlay, the Legislature in 1986 placed the first higher education general obligation bond issue on the ballot since the 1976 Community College Bond Act was defeated. Authorized for $400 million, it was approved by the voters and was entirely committed for the 1986-87 and 1987-88 fiscal years. Presently, a $600 million General Obligation bond issue is being considered by the Legislature (SB 703, Hart), which is proposed for the November 1988 ballot and which should cover the State's appropriation needs for at least 1988-89 and 1989-90.

Options for accommodating increasing enrollments and meeting capital outlay needs

You have asked us to identify a broad range of policy and funding options that the State might consider in accommodating increasing enrollments and in meeting the large repair, replacement, and new construction needs of higher education. At least nine options are possible:

1. *Increase utilization standards for classrooms and laboratories*

California already has some of the highest space and utilization standards in the nation. This means that we require our classrooms and teaching laboratories to be used by more students for more hours than most other states. Put another way, most states build larger buildings with more classrooms and laboratories for a given number of students than we do. Increasing the standards further could reduce capital costs, but it might also cause space reductions that would limit students' accessibility to classes, possibly increase the need for faculty, and probably lengthen the time students will need to complete their degrees. Such a decision might also increase support costs to such an extent that any savings realized from capital expenditures would be eliminated.

The high standards currently in place were instituted by the Legislature in 1973 in an attempt to reduce capital expenditures. In 1985, the Legislature called for a review of those standards, and in 1986 the Commission published a preliminary report on the subject (*Time and Territory: A Preliminary Exploration of Space and Utilization Guidelines in Engineering and the Natural Sciences*). We are currently engaged in a major effort to determine if those standards are appropriate (*Time and Territory: Phase II*).

2. *Year-round operations*

In response to the enrollment pressures in the 1960s, the State undertook a major experiment in year-round operation, with many of the four-year campuses introducing the quarter system. Subsequent experience with this approach demonstrated that few if any savings could be realized, primarily because of the reluctance of many students to attend the summer quarter, and the fact that the State-supported summer quarter replaced self-supported summer sessions. It appears from that experience that support costs would exceed capital outlay savings on most campuses.

3. *Expanded use of technology*

The use of computers and interactive television, on and off campus, is expanding access to higher education. These technological innovations are most often used to augment classroom instruction (such as with drills) or to offer televised classes. Unless adopted extensively -- and this could have a negative impact on the quality of higher education -- savings come primarily in the support area and not in capital outlay. However, it appears that computers and television, appropriately and selectively used, represent enhancements in academic programming, not devices for major savings, and the State should explore this avenue for providing access.

4. *Use of off-campus centers*

Off-campus centers, which do not have the full range of buildings and services found on a campus, have been used most by the Community Colleges and the State University. The primary purpose is to make education available to students who are distant from a campus, not to relieve the need for campus expansion. Off-campus centers, therefore, usually represent an expansion of access, not a strategy to reduce capital outlay costs.

5. *Greater use of the independent sector*

Since the purchasing power of student financial aid has been eroded during the 1980s, there is considerable evidence that some students are choosing public rather than independent colleges and universities. Recently the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education noted (1987, p. 24):

> State support for undergraduate student financial aid . . . has not always kept pace with undergraduate enrollment growth in the public and private institutions. 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.

The California Student Aid Commission, in noting that undergraduate enrollment demand in the independent segment has declined due to the widening gap between tuition costs and student financial aid, states that:

> The weakening of undergraduate enrollment demand at independent institutions will continue to increase pressures on public four-year institutions at the very time that demographic changes make it increasingly difficult for them to accommodate their existing share of college-bound students without significant new state expenditures of capital outlay funds for new facilities (1987).

6. *Tax incentives for private contributions to capital projects*

The State already offers many incentives for private giving to educational institutions. The State could expand these incentives by increasing deductibility or providing tax credits for donations for certain kinds of facilities.

7. *General Fund support for maintenance of non-State funded space*

Historically, the State has observed a policy of providing State support for maintenance and repair of facilities only if facilities were built with State funds. While there is still some logic to that policy, the Legislature may wish to re-evaluate it on a selective basis to encourage the segments to maximize opportunities for external funding of new buildings. At the present time, the segments are already seeking other sources of revenue for construction, but the long-term support costs to maintain non-State-funded space can be a deterrent to seek funds for instructional space.

8. *Encouraging lower-division students to attend the Community Colleges*

Redirection of freshmen to the Community Colleges was a State policy in the original Master Plan of 1960. Since there is excess capacity in most Community Colleges, redirection efforts could relieve some of the pressure on the four-year institutions. The State's current policy is to accomplish this redirection by making Community Colleges more attractive to lower-division students through some financial aid incentives, promoting intersegmental agreements to ensure ease of transfer, and supporting transfer centers to assist students. Expanding both aid and transfer agreements, as well as funding to enhance instruction at the Community College level, could in the long-run help relieve some of the enrollment pressures on the four-year institutions.

9. *Bond funding*

This has been the traditional approach throughout the United States to financing higher education facilities. Currently, SB 703 (Hart) provides for $600 million in general obligation bonds to be submitted to the voters on the November 1988 ballot. If approved by the Legislature and the voters, it will provide sufficient funding for higher education's needs for the next two to three years.

Revenue bonds have also been a popular method of funding, and may continue if SB 1191 (Petris) is approved to extend the Public Works Board's authorization to issue them.

However, debt service for general purpose revenue bonds (the High Technology bonds) is subject to the Gann Limit, whereas debt service for general obligation bonds is not. In addition, the interest rates on revenue bonds tend to be marginally higher than those applied to general obligation bonds, since the full faith and credit of the State is not behind them. Obviously, the Gann Limit presents a serious constraint on the continued use of High Technology bonds.

Conclusions

The three public segments indicate they will need capital outlay funds of somewhere between $7 to $8 billion between now and the year 2000, more than ever before provided by the State.

To meet these needs, the State will have to use a variety of options and funding sources. If even the minimal infrastructure needs of higher education are to be met, it appears that General Obligation bonds will be required. and we believe that the amount placed on the ballot should be sufficient to meet the capital outlay needs of the segments for several years.

The Legislature should also consider methods to make private donations for certain kinds of facilities more attractive to both the donors and the institutions. In terms of accommodating enrollment demand more evenly across the range of institutions, the Legislature should put a high priority on enhancing the Community College transfer function and providing student financial aid sufficient to make the independent colleges and universities a realistic option for more students.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Time and Territory. A Preliminary Exploration of Space and Utilization Guidelines in Engineering and the Natural Sciences* Commission Report 86-2. Sacramento: The Commission, February 1986.

--. *Time and Territory: Phase II: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in*

the 1985-86 Budget Act. Commission Report 86-12. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1986.

California Student Aid Commission. 1987 Budget Change Proposal. Sacramento: The Commission, 1987.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. *The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education.* Sacramento: The Commission, July 1987.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of March 1987, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Roger C. Pettitt, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Mountain View, *Vice Chairperson*
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Mokelumne Hill

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Arthur H. Margosian, Fresno; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Donald A. Henricksen, San Marino; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; representing the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission issues some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985: telephone (916) 445-7933.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH THE YEAR 2000

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 87-39

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

87-23 Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1985-86: The Eleventh in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities. (June 1987)

87-24 Looking to California's Pacific Neighborhood: Roles for Higher Education. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 82 (1986) (June 1987)

87-25 Institutional Reports on Pacific Rim Programs: Submissions by the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 82 (1986) (June 1987) (A supplement to Report 87-24.)

87-26 Major Gains and Losses: Part Two. A Staff Report on Shifts Since 1976 in the Popularity of Various Academic Disciplines as Fields of Study at California's Public Universities (June 1987)

87-27 Faculty Salary Revisions: A Revision of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs (June 1987)

87-28 Comments on the Second Draft of the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education, 1987 - 2002, by William H. Pickens. Executive Director's Report, June 1987 (June 1987)

87-29 Evaluation of the Commission's Office Automation System: A Post-Implementation Evaluation Report to the California State Department of Finance (June 1987)

87-30 California Colleges and Universities. [An alphabetical list of names, addresses, and telephone numbers.] (June 1987)

87-31 California Colleges and Universities Grouped by County (June 1987)

87-32 California Community College Districts and Colleges [An alphabetical list of districts and the colleges they operate, with district addresses, telephone numbers, and names of superintendents.] (June 1987)

87-33 Information Manual: A Guide to the Commission, Its Policies, Procedures, and Members (September 1987)

87-34 Information Manual: A Guide to the Commission, Its Policies, Procedures, Members, and Staff [A revision of Report 87-33 designed exclusiveiy for staff orientation purposes.] (September 1987)

87-35 Appropriations in the 1987-88 State Budget for the Public Segments of Higher Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (September 1987)

87-36 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1987)

87-37 Improving Student Performance Reporting, Review and Epilogue: The Final Report of the Commission's Project on Transforming Student Academic Performance Data into Useful Information (September 1987)

87-38 California College-Going Rates, 1986 Update: The Tenth in a Series of Reports on New Freshmen Enrollment at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (September 1987)

87-39 The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education Through the Year 2000: A Presentation by William H. Pickens to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, October 14, 1987 (October 1987)

87-40 Final Approval of San Diego State University's Proposal to Construct a North County Center (November 1987)

87-41 Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities: Progress Since 1985 and Suggestions for the Future (November 1987)