DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 973 JC 970 043

AUTHOR Raby, Rosalind Latiner
TITLE Community College Models: Myths and Realities of Access and Equality.
PUB DATE 6 Mar 95
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at "The University and the Community College," a conference sponsored by the University of South Africa (Pretoria, South Africa, March 6, 1995).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *College Role; *Community Colleges; Democracy; Foreign Countries; *Institutional Mission; *International Programs; Models; Organizational Development; Role of Education; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS California; South Africa

ABSTRACT

The community college model was developed in response to the inability of universities to meet economic needs and the demand for higher education. Configurations of this model include multipurpose institutions, combing academic, pre-university, technical, remedial, and continuing education; specialized orientations, offering 2 to 3 years of technical or occupational programs; a binary approach that bridges upper-secondary, postsecondary, college, and/or university education; and approaches that focus on life-long learning. Four characteristics of the community college model are that they exist between upper secondary and university education, they accentuate short-term career or personal development, they are not highly regarded, and they embody the ideal that low costs increase accessibility and economic democracy. For decades, developed and developing countries have used post-secondary education reform to counter socio-economic inequities. Two avenues for reform involve the relationship between community colleges and international development and the role of colleges as catalysts for reform. With respect to international development, however, problems exist with exporting the community college model, including financial considerations, academic considerations related to standards, and issues of cultural colonialism. With respect to the colleges as catalysts for reform, the struggle remains to implement an educational system that recognizes and endorses a multi-ethnic, multicultural society. Such an effort is currently being undertaken in both South Africa and California, although California's efforts are jeopardized by tight budgets, rising student fees, part-time instructor layoffs, and reduced class offerings. Contains 45 endnotes. (HAA)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE MODELS:

MYTH AND REALITIES OF ACCESS AND EQUALITY

Keynote Presentation:
"The University and Community College"
University of South Africa, Pretoria
March 6, 1995

Rosalind Latiner Raby, Ph.D.
Institute for International Programs
Los Angeles Community College District

INTRODUCTION: A WORLD IN TRANSITION

The 20th century witnessed a phenomena in which "universities and university-level specialized institutions alone cannot cope with either the needs of the economy nor the social demand for higher education. . . [and hence] the existence of a recognized alternative to traditional universities is indispensable."[1] The prototype of these institutions, the 19th century German *Volkhochschulens*, inspired an array of models to fill the void left by the "demanteling of the sacred trust of traditional universities."[2] Since 1960, there was an explosion of formalized post-secondary, pre-university non-traditional higher education institutions which offer short-cycle programs that train people in crafts, technology, and vocations as well as offer opportunities for professional and academic growth. Currently, there are over 4,000 such institutions found in 180 countries, in "an amorphous field" which Kintzer consolidates under the rubric *nonuniversities.*[3]

A comparative analysis of *nonuniversitites* is difficult because type, duration, content and even name differs regionally.[4] A concise, yet all-encompassing term that is non-elitist and non-ethnocentric has yet to emerge. The 1980s description, "short cycle short-term colleges and universities" is not concise and "short" and implies an inferior type of education.[5] The 1990s term "*nonuniversities*", while concise, conveys a negative connotation as "non" defines absence rather than choice. Since the majority of these institutions are technical/vocational, the term "community college" is also incomplete.[6] Furthermore, global application of the term (which is associated with the United States) elicits accusations of U.S. ethnocentrism. However, throughout the world, most countries have developed or are in various stages of developing some form of the community college model "with the appropriate balance between liberal and vocational education."[7] In the process, the community college model has become unique unto itself and is gaining prominence in terms of quantity and quality. For this reason, the term, community college model, may be the less deleterious of avaiable terms that describe this type of academic institution.

The United States two-year community (and formerly junior) colleges are publically supported higher education institution that mirror major educational, economic and social changes occurring in the country. U..S. Community Colleges provide a range of educational choices and serve a greater proportion of youth than in any other nation.[8] Community colleges are accredited to grant short-cycle Certificates, award the Associate degree as the highest degree and prepare non-certificated

graduates for the mid-level labor market. They provide a) in-service/re-training through adult basic educational programs, remedial education, vocational/technical education and community services; b) remedial courses to account for unprepared high school graduates deficiencies; c) English and acculturation courses for recent arrivals form other countries; and d) academic liberal arts and science transfer programs that can result in a bachelor's degree received at a four-year college/university.[9] All students over the age of seventeen are eligible to enroll, despite previous educational attainment or socio-economic status. As such, the student population mirrors the multicultural and multiethnic mixture of it's local community.

Since passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act, the number of U.S. community colleges has doubled. In 1994, over 1200 American community colleges enrolled six million students, 43% of all higher education students and four million, 51% of all non-credit adult and continuing education. In addition, 51% of all domestic students and 25% of all international students at four-year colleges were transfer students from community colleges. The ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges maintains that nationally over the past five years, a consistent 23-24% of community college students transfer to four-year universities. In 1993, 50% of California State University and 20% of University of California bachelor degree recipients were community college transfers.[10]

DEFINING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE MODEL

Cohen & Brawer (1989), Kintzer (1990; 1992; 1993), King & Fersh (1992) and Cohen (1994) identify four community college model configurations. The first model depicts a "multipurpose" tenor that combines academic, pre-university, re-training, technical, vocational/occupational, remedial, socio-cultural, continuing (adult), and other forms of educational instruction. The second provides a "specialized" orientation that offers two-three years of technical, vocational, or occupational programs. The third portrays a "binary" path that bridges upper-secondary, post-secondary, college and/or university education. Many models, exist as a distinct entity or as part of a university system, as some provide baccalaureates and other advanced degrees (both academic and occupational). The fourth model emphasizes life-long learning for literacy attainment or culture/social studies.

The community college model includes four identifiable characteristics. First, it exists between upper secondary and university education, it grants only certain types of certificates/

diplomas, and most attending students are secondary-school graduates. Although, included in national educational plans, many have a mission, curriculum and budget that expresses local (regional) concerns. Models are accountable to local universities for providing accredited pre-university curriculum and to local business for identifying curriculum that relates to the community's economic and socio-political needs. Cohen (1994) postulates that in nations where compulsory education ends early, models serve upper secondary, undergraduate collegiate and para-professional functions and are four-five years in duration. In countries where students attend school for 10+ years, models accentuate pre-baccalaureate, occupational and recurrent education studies often less than two years in duration.

Secondly, each model accentuates short-term career/personal development education that provides academic access and semi-professional, technical and vocational training to diverse sections of society. In this respect, the community college model presents a viable option for higher education that was once the sole realm of the university. Thirdly, on a global scale, the community college model is not highly regarded by governments, scholars or the populace. Often models are located in rural or in urban lower-class areas and frequently are poorly supported, both in terms of finance and in social status. As the number of students increases, so do the need for a broad base of services. This in turn multiplies costs resulting in a situation that "whenever short-cycle colleges are found financing is the primary dilemma."[11]

Finally, all models embody the ideal that relative low cost accentuates open accessibility which in turn, defines and perpetuates educational and thereby economic democracy. In particular, the U.S. model is believed to a) encourage educational access to students from predominantly lower socio-economic classes and subordinate minority ethnic groups; b) delineate an alternative route and a second chance opportunity for post-secondary education; c) increase availability of educational choices for disadvantaged populations which encourages greater participation in the overall economy; and d) provide flexibility regarding program, and the quality and output of education opportunities.[12] Accordingly, community colleges a) decrease social gaps and assist with transfer between secondary schools, post-secondary institutions and employment; and b) build democratic overtures in relation to societal change.

However, the ideal of equitable access leading to academic/career opportunities which then provides the foundation for economic/political reform is dubious at best. Difficulties exist in a) ensuring sufficient communication with business and industry, thereby weakening programmatic relevancy and future job placement, and b) maintaining academic autonomy while incorporating both the university and business agendas. Furthermore, even though tuition is consistently lower than university, it is still exorbitant for many students. The current phenomenon of privatization (private sponsorship) is altering accessibility for models found in Asia, Britain, Eastern Europe/FSU, and Latin America, and is eliminating access for thousands of students in the United States and Canada.

EDUCATION TO EVOKE SOCIAL CHANGE

For decades, developed and developing countries have used post-secondary education reform to counter socio-economic inequities. Two avenues for reform are of particular importance for community college models worldwide. The first embodies the interrelationship between community college models and international development. The second, places the college as a catalyst for reform as it becomes the sole means for many students to acquire international and inter/multicultural competency and literacy skills.

Community College Models and International Development

The community college model and the services it provides can evoke social reform as it has the "resources and expertise, especially in applied technology, that could serve well . . . in sustainable development."[13] When analyzing community college models, it remains critical to distinguish what type of education (academic, professional, vocational/technical, personal development) is provided for a particular population, what students actually do with this education, i.e. transfer to university, work or drop-out, and if this education fulfills the college's mission. For example, the vocational school fallacy[14] insinuates that two-year vocational/technical colleges which ignore a general education foundation, may not be an optimal means for solving manpower needs. These colleges are often cost-ineffective, have courses that are shortsighted, out-of-date and oftentimes irrelevant. Furthermore, due to poor national planning, appropriate jobs are lacking upon graduation. In this respect, the community college model does not evoke social reform.

Community college models in the U.S., Canada, Australia and Western Europe export services that influence an escalating number of post-secondary institutions abroad. The ideals of open

access/low cost education, plus the sharing of technical and short-cycle career curricula, dispensing proactive teaching methodologies and obtaining U.S./Canadian certification support both non-profit and for profit exportation ventures. As vocational/technological and ESL education continue to play a pivotal role in the economic development of developing countries, debates regarding exportation are increasing. Community college models were emulated in the 1970s in Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia and Mexico, and in the 1990s, in Armenia, Colombia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Russia, and South Africa as a means to invalidate the notion that higher education is an elitist venture intended for only the few.

Theoretically, two perspectives support community college international development efforts. The "privatization" perspective views educational transfer as a money-producing venture, for both donor and recipient colleges. This is evident in resulting contract education programs and in the hidden agenda of many international development projects. The "humanitarian" perspective views educational developmental assistance as a means to "apply our ideals, our sense of decency and our humanitarian impulse to the repair of the world,[as] investment in development is indeed investment in prevention."[15] International development activities facilitate informational exchange, between and within colleges, including faculty and administrator exchanges and sister-college relationships.

Frequently, it is a developing country's community college model that adopts information from a Western community college model. However, recently, similar transactions occur between models from developed countries. Decentralization reform and merging occupational education with university certification into a new configuration of a B.A. degree are two examples of transference from community college models in Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand to models in Canada and the U.S. Expanding access to telecommunications technologies further facilitates global networking and future educational endeavors on all levels.[16]

There are three primary problems with exporting community college models. On the financial level, substantial difficulties in executing these models exist in a globally economically strained period. The financial competition of a "for-profit philosophy" affects academic curriculum, relationships, and non-traditional program funding. The dichotomy of being unable to maintain low cost/open access undermines the community college basic philosophy and places its programs at risk.[17] This problem will be detailed in the California case study. The question of whether privatization compromises academic mission needs to be further researched.

On the academic level, defining standards that are acceptable to both donor and host countries may not result in equitable solutions. Cultural mis-communication may make educational assistance, academic standards and other concepts/procedures puzzling and unacceptable to the host institution. Specialized vocational curriculum may be irrelevant if graduates succumb to chronic unemployment.[18] Both positive and negative consequences of cultural neo-colonialism must be acknowledge by both donor and host institutions. Legal ramifications arise as both donor and host country's labor unions, accreditation teams, and state legislation/ministry of education scrutinize accountability and quality factors. Overwhelming eco-political and cultural adjustments may prevent successful development endeavors, especially those involving the transfer of a donor college to a foreign location. Restrictions aimed at maintaining local control in Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Korea and the Philippines are increasing the difficulty for Western countries to establish contract education and other international development projects.

Finally, on the philosophical level, the use of the community college model as a means to create and maintain democracy as well as to continue to influence economic/social reform oftentimes is blurred by the realities of cultural-colonialism and by the consequences of reinforcing economic and social dependency. Exporting United States/Western education is accompanied by stressing moral, linguistic and cultural westernization. The result may collide with the host country's citizenship training and may hinder any attempts to maintain cultural identity and autonomy in face of world homogenization. The ethics of "aid", "trade" and/or "neo-colonialism" through transplantation of Western models abroad highlights non-academic ulterior motives. Nonetheless, community college ideals, nonetheless, provoke positive reform, including the reduction of culture-conflict resulting from education of the underprivileged.

Implementation of community college model characteristics is a based on a matter of degree, ranging from *full transfer*, as in the case of Israel, to *semi-complete* transfer, as in the case of Egypt, to *emulation with retention* of indigenous character, as in the case of South Africa, to *rejection*, as in the case of the Japanese Branch colleges. At a time when basic community college ideals are being compromised and sometimes abandoned, questioning the degree of emulation, either through import or export becomes all the more critical.

International, and Inter/Multicultural Education: A Catalyst for Reform

Despite a diverse range of educational services offered by community college models, there remains a critical need for these colleges to actively establish an internationally, inter/multiculturally literate generation that can deal with the complexities of our world. The interdependency of nations touches the everyday lives of citizens and advances in technology intensify international competition and cooperation. In order for students to work and live effectively in an increasingly international/ multicultural world, they must understand, without bias, the histories, goals and values, i.e. the cultures of the world community. Such understanding forms the basis for international and inter/ multicultural competency. This competency requires more than simple awareness, it demands a deep understanding of the world and of the interrelationships that exist between different cultures. As students gain this competency, they become empowered with knowledge that assists them in all future endeavors. The community college model is indeed poised to make key contributions to this type of reform by creating, implementing and evaluating international and inter/multicultural educational policies and programs. Such international competency is essential for communities undergoing extreme social and cultural change.

Since the mid-1980s, U. S. international and inter/multicultural educational programs were fueled by changing college environments that reflected a multicultural and multilingual society. Community colleges reacted by supplying services for a) induction of refugees/immigrants who require language services; b) transformation of the community into an international frontier that demand special skills; and c) servicing of a multicultural population which possess varying interests. In the next century, community college models must be able to meet new educational concerns that reflect language education for nationalism resurgence and for assimilation. In so doing, colleges must accomodate sufficient remedial majority language classes (for assimilation) and non-majority language academic and professional instruction (for cultural revitalization).

Three rationales support these programs. The political rationale, born during the cold war and sustained in the post-cold war era, perceives this education as a pragmatic tool for national security. The economic rationale recognizes the importance of international trade and views such education as a requirement for participation in the world market economy. Finally, the humanist rationale promotes the understanding of other languages and cultures as a tool which eventually

contributes towards the building of tolerance and peace. Regardless of intent or rationale, the need to educate students who are able to deal with various contemporary global agendas was and remains central in preparing these students for future political, economic and moral roles in society.

The only introduction most academic (transfer) and technical/professional students have to international and inter/multicultural literacy is through community college model courses and experiences. It cannot be assumed that students will gather this information in the future, as there is no guarantee that university upper division courses (for transfer students) or the work environment will socialize an international or inter/multicultural focus. Likewise, faculty and administration at community colleges cannot assume the ease of internationalization without undertaking extensive staff development efforts.

Community college models differentiate between intercultural/multicultural[19] and international programs. These two components are often placed under the rubric of *global education* even though they may take separate but not necessarily conflicting directions. In particular, inter/multicultural education advances bilingual education, ethnic studies and foreign language programs. International education fosters study abroad, faculty exchange, international students, international development and internationalizing the curriculum programs. Inter/multicultural programs stress interaction of many cultures within a domestic setting with the educational focus on pluralism at the micro level. International programs accent interaction of different cultures on a global scale with educational focus on pluralism at the macro level. Despite rivalry in political and budget power struggles, both programs have begun to discern conceptual similarities and appreciate one another's theoretical differences. Both share the goal of accelerating knowledge about and encouraging cross-cultural communication that enhances cultural, ethnic, class and gender relationships among divergent groups. In so doing, they help define policy in college mission statements, a means of securing implementation of skills. Collaboration encourages innovative attempts to harmoniously promote a single agenda, connecting domestic well-being with world conditions.

As community college models increasingly mirror their multicultural societies, it becomes essential to implement mechanisms within the classroom and throughout the college that capture the essence of diversity. In this manner, students/faculty may surpass conflict that occurs when a myriad of cultures are suddenly bound together and when individuals must communicate with people from

different cultures in both classroom and social settings. The struggle remains to implement an educational system that acknowledges, endorses and repsects the diviersity of a multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural society. Such is the task currently being undertaken by South Africa and California. The remainder of this paper highlights the California example.

CASE-STUDY OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Fifty years ago, California was the first state to implement a three tiered higher education system that included a) University of California (UC); b) State University (CSU); and c) Community College. The 1960 Master Plan of Higher Education delineated an integrated system that guaranteed universal, easy access, high quality yet inexpensive college education for all high school graduates or persons otherwise equally qualified. Due to the success of this Plan, it has been emulated nationally and globally. One of the more renown features, the community college component has "permitted access for higher education to elsewhere unheard of number of citizens."[20]

California supports 107 community colleges with 70,000 full and part-time staff members that enrolls over 1.3 million students (60% of all public higher education students) and nearly one in fourteen adults is a community college student. In Fall, 1994, 335,000 full-time students; 814,000 part-time students, 190,000 students were taking non-credit community service courses. These colleges vary in size, location and venue, yet combined, reflect a multiethnic and culturally diverse California. California community college students are 19.9% Hispanic (other than Filipino), 11.8% Asian-American or Pacific Islander, 7.2% Black and 1.1% Alaskan Native/American-Indian. In addition, 216,000 international students attend various colleges.[21] Due to its basic composition, California community colleges offer a variety of opportunities for a significant proportion of the society to develop international and inter/multicultural competency skills.

Despite evident popularity, California community colleges are facing a battle for survival as enrollment conflicts with financial resources. Community college enrollment has been augmented by four variables over the past few decades. Re-training programs proliferated as the economic reality that college graduates earn more over a lifetime than those without (88% more in 1988 as compared to 40% in 1980) became apparent. The mass influx of immigrants/refugees into California created unforeseen demographic phenomena that altered the composition of communities and defined the community college as a medium for acculturation. Promotional campaigns for lifelone and re-

education targeted at women, minorities, and seniors further increased enrollment. Finally, the 1980s predicted demographic depression never materialized which added considerably more students to community colleges than was originally envisioned. As the 1940s baby-boom grandchildren become college-age, full-time community college students are expected to increase by 219,000. Even without the consequences of new students, existing excess will stress community colleges and the entire California higher education system until well after the year 2010.[22]

The fastest growing student enrollment is among non-White ethnic and racial minorities of Asians, Hispanics, Blacks, Pacific Islanders and American Indians. Table One illustrates this growth rate. In some colleges, and indeed throughout many communities in the state, the "new majority" signifies that minorities are now the numerical majority. Despite numerical presence, minority students are most affected by tuition increases which results in a disproportionate effect on enrolment patterns. There is also discrepancy in course completion rates that is highest among Asians (taking and completing 11.2 units/semester) and lowest among Hispanics and Blacks (taking and completing 9.2 units/semester).[23] This disparity is due to a combination of low-income/poverty related financial problems, including child rearing responsibilities, work schedules and immigration status.

TABLE ONE: ETHNIC AND RACIAL STUDENT PERCENTAGES: 1992 - 1994

	1992 % OF COLLEGE	1994 % OF COLLEGE	% AT LACCD	
			1972	1988
ASIAN	9.9%	11.1% - 16%	5.5%	14.3%
HISPANIC	25.6%	26.5%	16.1%	28.5%
BLACKS	7.9%	7.9% - 18%	19.7%	18.0%
WHITES	50.9%	48.5%	56.2%	36.0%

Although enrollment continues to rise, foundational and economic support is actually decreasing. In 1995, the situation deteriorated to the point where the Master Plan "open door" policy is at jeopardy and where the California higher education system may no longer survive into the next century. State Chancellor, David Merts admits that "the core issue of the Master Plan is access into higher education [and] for most people that means access to Community Colleges . . . we have not

been able to fully implement that goal."[24] Variables that adversely affect the California trademark of community college excellence will now be examined.

Variables That Jeopardize The Master Plan

Since 1992, tight budgets, rising student fees, part-time instructor layoffs, and reduced class offerings have denied community college education for tens of thousands of Californians.

DECLINING BUDGET

Although community colleges are the most cost-effective educational institution in the State, their budget, which is derived from local property taxes and a state budget, continues to decrease. The California state general budget allocates a State General Fund for all higher education. The percentage of money provided to this Fund has decreased from 17% in 1975 to 12 % in 1994. In addition, a series of laws aimed at lowing property taxes resulted in a deficit for community colleges of over $ 300 million, as of December 16, 1994. Oregon State indicates similar budget problems as a consequence of Measure 5 (1990) that lowered property taxes and adversely effected the amount of money available for higher education.[25] Table Two depicts current costs of educating students at public educational institutions

Since 1992, worsening fiscal conditions result in several repercussions. Tuition increased annually, thousands of full-time faculty were enticed into early retirement, and 2,800 part-time instructors (9% of total) were laid-off. At the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), part-timers were reduced by 13% in 1991 and again by 9% in 1994. State-wide reduced administrative expenditures negatively effected the budgets for counseling, roof and building repairs, janitorial services, campus maintenance, and instructional and other equipment replacement/repair. To control the budget crisis, some colleges consolidated or even eliminated certain academic and professional programs. For example, in 1994, Cabrillo College District curtailed the electronics technology division (which cut 24 staff positions and terminated tenured instructors).[26]

TABLE TWO: COST OF EDUCATION PER STUDENT[27]

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION	COST OF EDUCATION PER STUDENT
K-12 (Primary and Secondary Schools)	$ 4,428
Community Colleges	$ 2,809
California State University System	$ 7,619
University of California System	$ 16,418

TUITION

To compensate for the budget crisis, tuition continues to rise. Since 1992, tuition increased almost 40%, from $5 to $13 per unit. In 1995, a full-time student pays $ 200 in fees (each semester), not counting books, supplies, transportation. Although tuition for California is one of the lowest for community colleges nationally, it is considerably more than it was a few years ago. In 1993 a $ 50 per unit fee was introduced for students already possessing a bachelor's or higher degrees resulting in 60,000 students dropping out of community colleges. 61% of Los Angeles Pierce College students left as a direct result of this increase. State-wide data confirms that recent fee increases "may have weeded out the less serious or less financially secure students."[28] Increased tuition invalidates the Master Plan that guarantees no or low fees. A combination of increased fees, reductions in course sections, job, family, and other pressures have forced thousands of students, especially those most in need of community college serves from the system.[29]

REDUCED EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND QUANTITY

Significant course selection reduction is a direct result of fewer part-time faculty, less tenured faculty and departmental consolidation. Since 1992, nearly 10% of the state's curricula, 14,000 courses, were eliminated. The LACCD terminated 15% of its courses, roughly 1,900 class sections. State-wide, liberal arts and vocational education classes are targed and notable section reductions occur in courses largely staffed by part-timers, such as English, math and business. As a result, sporadic classes result in long waiting lists that delay students in taking required courses for graduation. Hence, not only the ideal of short-term education (i.e., two years) is a myth, but such delays increase total educational expenses. Since 1990, both Los Angeles and Chicago have a median time from enrollment to graduation of 4.25 years. Noted discrepancies in length of enrollment vary

with race with Asians and Whites graduating faster than Hispanics and Blacks.[30] Attempts at increasing financial aid have limited success in compensating for this extended time.[31] Another consequence is an increase in faculty work load and class size. Full-time faculty teach 17 hours of classroom time (typically six, three-unit classes) per week. Faculty/student ratio grew from 27/1 in 1992 to 31/1 in 1994. Many basic and beginning classes that normally have 35 students, now have at least 45 students. Larger classes impact teaching style and quality. Since 1992, poor academic foundation plus inability to pay tuition decrased student transfers to universities by 11%. Continued reduction in educational quality and quantity will further increase these numbers.

A byproduct of a quality decrease is the production of inadequately prepared graduates. These graduates are the state's future professional and mid-level workers whose knowledge will affect not only their work, but society itself.[32]

DECREASING ENROLLMENT

From 1991-1995, California community college enrollment declined 15% primarily due to students being unable to afford tuition or being unable to get needed classes. State enrollment decreased from 1,531,000 in 1991 to 1,500,000 in 1992 to 1,376,000 in 1993 to 1,340,000 in Fall, 1994. As a result, while community colleges used to serve one in eleven adults in 1992, it currently serves one in fourteen adults. In 1994, the LACCD lost more students than twenty-seven other California districts had in total enrollment. LACCD enrollment dropped 17% from 117,000 in 1991 to 96,500 in Spring 1994. It must be noted, that the Northridge earthquake was a major culprit in this loss, and as the earth stabilizes, so will enrollment. Nonetheless, an estimated 100,000 students were turned away solely because of unavailable classes. Ironically, the state's $300 million deficit could cover most of the cost of new classes, counselors and other instructional services for students to whom community college edcation has been denied.[33] A consequence of decreasing enrollment is that the gateway to higher education is being limited to all but the most financially and academically able students.

Revision Of The Master Plan

As Californians face the consequences that certain ideals of the Master Plan conflict with reality and that higher education is increasingly only available to the elite, many academicians and politicians are agreeing with UC Berkeley Chancellor Chang Lin-Tien's statement that "the Master

Plan has been a great success, but we should make some adjustments."[34] A revised plan would notably differ in the treatment of critical issues than did the 1960 Plan. In 1960, an availability of resources was taken for granted, yet in 1995 they are known to be at risk. In 1960, the notion of open access easily became a reality. Today it is not, and may never be again. However, despite the differences, the ideas of access and quality are even more important for 1995 than ever before because denying an opportunity for higher education would be a moral, economic and political tragedy. Repercussions will effect the economy via lack of new knowledge and higher skills, and will widen societal schisms, diminish participatory citizenry and increase potential for multiethnic, multicultural and multi-class conflict. The 1994 report, Time for Decision aptly claims that.

> the policies of the past three years have dampened aspirations and discouraged enrollment. The time for hand-wringing about California's crisis in higher education is over. It is time to decide. Is the state still committed to open access or is it not? Should higher education expand or contract? What mix of state revenues, tuition, fees, and private giving is required to support higher education in California? How can colleges and universities become more productive?[35]

Some academic and political leaders maintain that higher educational problems are a result of voters decision, and like fate, there is nothing that can be done to alter the situation.[36] Others are making difficult decisions regarding reform and some have begun to implement change.

One such decision is sparking tremendous debate. David Breneman, Harvard Graduate School of Education 1995 review of current conditions includes several recommendations for change. One suggestion is for community colleges to prefer admission to "younger students in academic transfer and occupational/vocational courses of instruction over non-degree younger students, returning older students and students pursuing a personal enthusiasm."[37] This recommendation supports a trend that envisions community colleges as becoming responsible for all academic lower-division instruction since these colleges teach these courses in the most cost-effective manner.

The element of "personal enthusaism" includes community services, personal development, remedial, basic skills, ESL and acculturation courses. Even though remedial, basic skills and ESL education are also cost-effectively taught and are the fastest growing form of community college instruction, since these courses are defined as "personal enthusiasm" and are non-degree oriented they have and continue to be subject to intense budget cuts. While some support these cuts claiming their

emphasis opposes the community college mission, others note that it is precisely these programs that allow college access to thousands who would otherwise fall through the cracks of society. Indeed, these programs are indispensable to escalating numbers of students who are unprepared for college level instruction and to new immigrants/refugees who have limited English skills. Many courses are now academic prerequisites for 40% of students enrolled in career skills and technical training programs.[38] Recognizing, the merits of community colleges in this area, in 1994, Sacramento City College and Mesa Community College faculty taught 35% of UC Davis and UC San Diego freshmen, respectively, remedial English classes. Due to the success of these programs, they will be extended in 1995 to include remedial math.[39] The debate continues.

There is also significant discussion that a revised Master Plan implement other innovations such as educational technology that broadens student access while requiring fewer faculty, operation of year-round campuses; a three-year bachelor's degree, and adoption of certain British reforms that stress the entrepreneurial leadership of community colleges in terms of controlling and being accountable to their own budgets.[40] Many of these innovations are currently under review.

One notable change is a concrete effort to define accountability that evaluate the effects of current problems are having on colleges and students. The 1988 state legislative law, A.B. 1725, specifically sought to clarify the community college mission, set standards of success and define various types of accountability information. A 1994 accountability report highlighted enrollment persistence (the percentage of students enrolling in consecutive semesters), completion rates and transfer rates. State-wide, 55.9% of students who enrolled in Fall, 1992 "persisted" through Spring 1993 semester. In June 1993, 50,123 degrees and 21,379 certificates were awarded. The report concluded that first semester and the transition to the second semester are critical times for persistence. It is especially important that during this period infrastructure securities (counseling and availability of classes) plus sufficient financial assistance are present. This correlation is responsible for persistence increases at the LACCD, Peralta District, Rancho Santiago College and Santa Barbara City College. The State Chancellors Office confirms 97.1% of students who receive counseling and matriculation services, not only persist, but graduate as well. In addition, 70% of non-returning students are part-timers who often have conflicts between class and work schedules.[41] As previously mentioned, current problems do impact graduation and transfer rates.

Current Concerns

The 1995 California Higher Education Policy Center report suggests that the Governor "declare a state of emergency of indefinite duration to deal with the crisis facing California public higher education.[42] This suggestion is based on evidence that community colleges and other higher education institutions can no longer sustain educational ideals envisioned and expected by divserse sections of society. In particular, students and parents want access, quality, availability of instruction and low costs; faculty want competitive salaries, no increasing teaching loads and participation in all academic decisions; politicians want quality instruction at the lowest possible costs; trustees and regents want state support and finally, the economy needs a skilled labor force able to utilize new technology. However, these groups continue to ignore the fact that education has been adversly altered by the fiscal crisis. The proposed "state of emergency" will force the public to alter the situation in which "the cost of incarcerating one prisoner for one year, could send two students to the UC, three students to a CSU and seven students to a community college"[43] by redefining and implementing new educational priorities.

Radical reform is needed, but has yet to materialize. On a more positive note, however, there are several people who are vocalizing concern that turning society's back on higher education is suicidal. In the aftermath of the 1993 race/social class riots that plagued several California cities and Los Angeles in particular, and the recent passing of Proposition 187 that denies educational (and other societal services) to curb illegal immigration, there is recognition that denying the growing number of new college-age students access to college may be the fuse that ignites new social upheaval and conflict. There are beginning signs that the public is realizing that perpetuating a system that denies opportunity and quality education also deprives the state of key leadership in business, in industry, in political participation, and in the creation of moral citizenry. As the new century dawns, the future of California depends on the perpetuation and enhancement of the California higher education Master plan. [44]

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As community college models become more common worldwide, certain considerations must be acknowledged regarding ideals and performance. This article delineates some variables that account for community college success and variables that can undermine success. LACCD

Chancellor Neil Yoneji defines success as being dependent on two fundamental principles: 1) student access to the educational system; and 2) success achieved by students once they are in the college.[45] California academicians highlight the following elements as essential ingredients for a thriving community college system:

- Qualified faculty who possess current, up-to-date information and can assist students gain employment upon graduation;
- Formal and nonformal educational opportunities for citizenship building and moral education.
- Promotion of language skills, English, minority and international languages;
- Student personnel services which includes guidance and counseling specialists, job placement, and student councils;
- Student access assistance which includes providing classes, publishing a class schedule, application and registration unification, facilitation and innovation;
- Library which includes a variety of books and learning materials as well as librarians;
- Effective and varied teaching methods which includes (lectures; problem-oriented discussions; demonstrations; practical tutorials; role play; case studies; tours; modified team teaching);
- Community service activities which includes lectures for small business, and community access to physical education, adult education and arts/cultural events. In addition, building/ room space needs to be made available to community outreach efforts and services;
- Administrative problems which includes how to resolved lack of classroom space and recreational areas, freedom for using funds and faculty and student participation in policy making.

These components can be applied to community college models worldwide and in particular, to those in South Africa. There are notable similarities between South Africa and California as both regions are in the process of eliciting educational reform. While South Africa is creating a community college model system, California is reinventing one. Both systems must educate unique populations and seek to provide a new generation with skills that will ensure employment, prosperity and peace for the next century. Both South Africa and California are also multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural and therefore require an educational structure that acknowledges, endorses and respects

that diversity. The implications for South Africa and other countries interested in creating, revising or upbringing community college models are clear. It is equally important to learn and understand both ideals and realities of various community college models in the attempt to avoid future mistakes and to implement new realities.

ENDNOTES

1. Cerych, L., "The Return to Europe: Issues in Post-Community Higher Education", in A. Levine (Ed.), Higher Learning in America: 1980 - 2000 (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993): 5

2. Kintzer, Frederick C., "Higher Education Approaches the 21st Century: New Perspectives on Nonuniversities", Presentation to the Nova Southeastern University, (August, 1994): 4.

3. Kintzer, 1994: 4; Kintzer, Frederick C., "Higher Education Beyond the U.S.: A Glimpse of Short-Cycle Higher Education in Other Countries" Community/Junior Community College Quarterly 16 No. 1 (1992): 1.

4. This field includes, among others regional colleges, colleges of further education, technical institutes, vishe shkole, tecknicums, junior colleges and community colleges.

5. The term, "Short-Cycle Higher Education", emerged from an OECD-sponsored conference, in Grenoble, France, in 1971. At this conference, specific models from France, Norway, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia were compared. Similarities found have subsequently been applied to similar institutions worldwide. (OECD, 1973).

6. Indeed, of the over 4000 institutions, the majority are technical rather than academic, national not community, private not public, postcompulsory not necessarily postsecondary, and certificate-granting rather than degree-granting. For this reason, Kinzter prefers the term "*nonuniversity*".

7. Koltai, Leslie, "Are There Challenges and Opportunities for American Community Colleges on the International Scene?" Keynote Address at the Comparative and International Education Society Western Region Conference, Los Angeles: California (November 5-6,1993):6

8. Kerr, Clark, Preserving the Master Plan, Occasional Paper (Sacramento: California Higher Education Policy Center, October 1994)

9. Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B., The American Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982)

10.Raby, Rosalind Latiner "Introduction" in Rosalind Latiner Raby and Norma Tarrow (Eds.) Dimensions of the Community College: International and Inter/Multicultural Dimensions (New York: Garland Publishing Press, 1995) Cohen, A.M., "Community Colleges" Chapter in International Encyclopedia of Education (2nd Ed.), (New York: Pergamon Press, 1994)

11. Ishumi, A.G.M., "Vocational Training as an Educational and Development Strategy: Conceptual and Practical Issues", International Journal of Educational Development, 83 (1988); Kintzer, Frederick C., "Kenya's Harambee Institutes of Technology" Community College Review, 17 No. 3 (Winter, 1990): 15

12. Kintzer, Frederick, "The Regional Technical College System in Ireland", Higher Education in Europe (UNESCO, Bucharest, March 1982): 58-59

13. Elsner, Paul A., Joyce S. Tsunoda, Linda A. Korbel, "Building the Global Community: The Next Step" Points of Departure for the American Council on International Intercultural Education/Stanley Foundation Leadership Retreat, (November 28-30, 1994); ACIIE Chairman Joins Washington Task Force in ACIIE Newsletter, July/August 1994: 1

14. Selvarathuam, V., "Limits to Vocationally-Oriented Education in the Third World" International Journal of Educational Development, 8, 1988. See: P.J. Foster, "The Vocational School Fallacy in Development Planning", in J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (Eds.) Power and Ideology in Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965); D.W. Chapman & D.M. Windham, "Academic Program "failures" and the Vocational School "Fallacy", Policy issues in secondary education in Somalia International Journal of Education Development, 5 (1985); W. Grubb, "The Convergence of Educational Systems and the Role of Vocationalism" Comparative Education Review, 29, 1985.; and G. Paschaapoulos, "To Vocationalize or not to Vocationalize? That is the Curriculum Question" International Review of Education, XXXIII.

15. In the past two decades there has been a wide variety of United States community college assistance, development and contract education programs worldwide. Because of the diversity, a listing of all types of programs is greater than space would allow. However, a representative examples are provided below of this type, It must be noted that not all the listed programs are successful, as many ending soon after they were initiated. The majority have affiliations with the fifty-two member U.S. and Canadian Community College consortium, *Community Colleges for International Development* (CCID) led by Brevard Community College (Florida), and the new College Consortium International (CCI), and International Consortium for Economic and Educational Development (ICEED). See: Raby, 1995, Cohen, 1994; Koltai, 1993; and Maxwell C. King and Seymour H. Fersh, Integrating the International/Intercultural Dimension in the Community College (Cocoa, Florida: Association of Community College Trustees and Community Colleges for International Development, Inc., 1992.

Assistance and development programs between CCID member colleges and the Republic of China; TELESUR,Republic of Surinam; National Taiwan Institute of Technology; U.S. Education Foundation of India; Technical University of Bucharest; University of Budapest; Czech Technical University in Prague, Association of Colombian Universities; Supreme Council of Egyptian Universities; Neva College, St. Petersburg, Russia; International Business School in Russia, ICEED agreement between community colleges in southern United States and CONALEP (Mexico) and Canadian Community Colleges); Work is being planned in Australia, Guyana, Romania, and Slovak.

Contract education programs and Branch College Programs: (1) Broward Community College (Florida) and Columbo International College in Seville and Marbella Spain, Kolej Damansara Utama (KDU), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, ISS International School, Singapore. Buenos Aires, Argentina; (2) Los Angeles Community College District (California) and Center for International Studies in Madrid, CONALEP, Mexico, Tokyo-American Community College, Williams Business College in Sydney, Australia; International Education Specialists, Manila; American Community College of Asturias, Northern Spain; (3) Lincoln Land Community College (Illinois) and Maktab Sains MARA community college in Kuantan, Malaysia; (4) Bookdale Community College (New Jersey) and Guayaquil, Ecuador; (5) Edmonds Community College (Washington) and Kobe & Tokyo, Japan; (6) Ohio State University and Kazan Pedagogical Institute in Tatarstan; (7) Big Bend Community College (Washington) and American Military Bases in Europe; (8) Green River Community College (Washington) and Kanuma, Japan; (9) Mt. Hood Community College (Oregon) and Kojima, Japan; (10) Sullivan County Community College (New York) and Koyama Perfecture, Japan; (11) Coastline Community College (California) and CONALEP, Mexico; (12) Middlesex Community College (Massachusetts) and China; (13) Black Hawk College (Oklahoma) and Noordlijke Hogeschool, Holland; (14) North Hennepin Community College (Minnesota) with Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology in Melbourne; (15) Miami-Dade Community College (Florida) and the American International College of Mexico; (16) Mission Community College (California) and Stamford Group in Bangkok, Thailand; (17) Consumnes River Community College (California) and Stamford Group in Kuala Lumpur; (18) Utah Valley State College and Utah Valley State College in Kiev.

16. Examples are the use of telecommunications to share class experiences between students at Maricopa community College District and Moscow University, between Coast Community College District and CONALEP schools, and of course, instantaneous exchange of information via INTERNET.

17. Immerwahr, John and Steve Farkas, The Closing Gateway: Californians Consider Their Higher Education System (San Jose: The California Higher Education Policy Center and the Public Agenda Foundation, 1993)

18. Kintzer, 1990

19. In community college literature, including the recent "Building the Global Community: The Next Step", a draft policy that seeks to define the direction and implementation of strategies for community college international, intercultural and multicultural programs, the terms "intercultural" and "multicultural" are used synonymously. Elsner, Tsunoda, Korbel, 1994

20. California Higher Education Policy Center, Time for Decision: California's Legacy and the Future of Higher Education: A Report with Recommendations (San Jose, The California Higher Education Policy Center, 1994): 23; Kerf, 1994; California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) Report, "A Dream Deferred" (quoted in Kerf, 1994)

21. These numbers reflect the 1992-1993 academic year. The 1993-1994 academic year has similar statistics, but is not as accurate due to an 18.6% unknown/non-respondent rate (as opposed to 4.1% in 1992 and 5.8% in 1991). MIS: May 3, 1994; McCurdy, Jack, "Broken Promises: The Impact of Budget Cuts and Fee Increases on the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, California Higher Education 1994); Rosalind Latiner Raby, CCIE Annual Report, Los Angeles: LACCD, 1994 & 1995; The News, CCLC, Nov/Dec, 1994

22. An estimated increase of 413,000 students for the State Universities and 42,000 for the University of California System. Kerf, 1994

23. Cross Talk, "Minority Enrollment Gains", CROSS TALK, 2, No. 3 (Oct. 1994); Ryerson, Dick, "The Ground Continues to Shift Beneath California's Community Colleges" S4CD Interaction Newsletter 5, No. 1, (Fall, 1994): 5; Trombley, William, "California Higher Education: Searching for a Solution" CROSS TALK 2 No. 3 (October, 1994) ; CCLC, 1994; McCurdy, 1994; Kerr, 1994; and Dillon, 1990.

24. CCLC, "Master Plan Promises Seen as Broken, New Approaches Envisioned by Leaders" The News, CCLC, (Nov./Dec.1994)

25. CCLC Master Plan, 1994; McCurdy, 1994

26. "Trouble to the North: Oregon Higher Education Struggles with Financial Woes" CROSS TALK 2 NO. 3, (Oct. 1994); Trombley, 1994; McCurdy, 1994

27. McCurdy, 1994: 24

28. CCLC, "Measuring Student Success - Persistence, Retention and SPRE" The News, CCLC, (Nov. - Dec, 1994): 1-3

29. McCurdy, 1994; Trombley, 1994; Time for Decision, 1994

30. Dillon, Paul H., "The Myth of the Two Year College - Length and Variation in the Time Students Take To Complete Associate Degree Requirements" Report No. SEC - 003 - PD, Office of Research, Planning and Analysis (Los Angeles: Educational Services Division, LACCD, September 1990)

31. McCurdy, 1994

32. McCurdy, 1994

33. Trombley, William, "Downward Trend" CROSSTALK 3, No. 1 (January, 1995);Time for Decision, 1994; McCurdy, 1994 Capital Report, 1994; Master Plan CCLC, 1994

34. Master Plan, CCLC, 1994: 9

35. Time for Decision ,1994: 9

36. Mission Statement, CCLC, 1994

37. David Breneman quoted in "A State of Emergency", CROSSTALK, 3, No. 1 (January, 1995): 4

38. McCurdy, 1994

39. Trombley, 1994; "English 57: Cooperative Venture Unites UC and Community Colleges" CROSSTALK 3, No. 1, (January, 1995)

40. Master Plan, 1994; Trombley, 1994

41. CCLC, 1994. Persistence rates rose at Santa Barbara City College from 65% in 1983 to 71% in 1992; at Rancho Santiago College from 37% in 1988 to 56% in 1994; and in Peralta District from 42% in 1988 to 78% in 1994.

42. David W. Breneman, quoted in "A State of Emergency" CROSS TALK, Vol. 3, No. 1 January, 1995

43. Contra Costa Times, August 16, 1994

44. Trombley, 1994

45. Yoneji, Neil, Chancellor, Perspective: The Chancellor's Remarks to the Board of Trustees (Los Angeles, LACCD, October 12, 1994).

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

JC 970 043

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Community College Models: Myth & Realities of Access & Equality

Author(s): Rosalind Latiner Raby

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: March, 1995

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Rosalind Latiner Raby

Printed Name/Position/Title: Rosalind Latiner Raby, Ph.D.

Organization/Address:
Institute for International Prgm
LACCD
770 Wilshire Blvd.
L.A. CA. 90017

Telephone: (818) 882-9931

FAX: (818) 882-9837

E-Mail Address: rabysl@aol.com

Date: Jan. 15, 1997

(over)