

**STEVEN STEPANEK** – Faculty Senate President,

What we like to do now is to start the panel discussion on 'The Times They Are a-Changin''. As it says in the program, and I'll briefly read it and it's up there. The past few years have clearly demonstrated that the teaching and learning environment at CSU Northridge within the CSU system and throughout the state of California has radically changed. Will there be a new master plan for higher education? Who will write it? What would be its purpose? These and many other questions are what President Koester actually raised this morning. [00:30]

We have three panels and they're gonna take various approaches to this. Our three panelists were selected based on their backgrounds. All three are educators but in their current positions, they represent some real specific experiences in one of the three pillars of education governance and policy making within the CSU. Let me see. I just start at the end, so what we have is **Barbara Swerkes**. She is here because of her vast experience in faculty governance and involvement in statewide academic issues. Then we have **Theresa Montano**, and she is here in her role as the campus CFA president. And then we have **Cynthia Rawitch** and we recognize her fact as a previous faculty person but she is now in the capacity of being associate vice president of academic studies. So what we have here are representatives from the union, administration, and faculty governance. [01:38]

So, let's start this conversation with what higher education will look like in the near future in California. Now the format that we're gonna be using is that we're going to allow for a no more than 10-minute presentation by each of these three people where they'll be able to say whatever it is they like to express with regards to this particular issue, then there will be a second round of no more than 5 minutes where each person will be allowed to provide a rebuttal or provide additional information. After that, we're then gonna open it up and we hope to have a fair amount of time so we can take questions from the audience. Now to try--this is more aimed at the panelists, to try to make sure that we stay within that 10-minute timeframe and the 5-minute timeframes, if you see me at the end starting to wave this sign which says 2-minute warning, it means just that. You have two minutes to wrap up for this particular time period. I thought you're gonna provide a plant in front of each one of us. [Laughter] I heard that. Okay, so why don't we again start at the end. Barbara, would you like to start? [02:45]

**BARBARA SWERKES:** That would be my pleasure. Steven invited me here as a representative of faculty governance. I have had the very pleasant experience you might say for the past 10 years of representing this campus on the statewide academic senate and previous to that many years on our campus senate right up until my retirement this past year. So--and I am still working down at the chancellor's office even though I am now officially off the payroll here at Cal State Northridge. [03:23]

So, I'd have lots of opportunities to observe what is happening from the framework of faculty governance and there were many topics when we started talking about the times they are changing that I could have selected but given our timeframe, I thought about the many things, especially in the past 2 years that were very prominent in what was happening from the framework of the governance at the statewide academic senate. As a member of the executive committee of that group, I had lots of

opportunity to wander the halls in Sacramento visiting with legislators and talking to their aids and trying to bring forward the perspective of faculty in the CSU. [04:12]

So when given this charge, the one topic I thought that had most impact or the potential for the most impact President Koester has already mentioned but I'm gonna take a focus for a little bit of time that I have on the master plan and what is happening with the master plan. It's kind of unique that our theme focuses on the times they are changing the song from Bob Dylan that was written in 1963 and as I shared with President Koester, I share that particular college generation. It was a framework for how we thought and the things that motivated us through, and for me in particular through my whole career in looking at change. [05:06]

One thing that happened in the state of California in the '60s was the creation of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. At that time--in the 1960, that was approved by the legislature and its intention was to deal with some of the unrest really that was occurring in higher education because at that time there was no coordination, political power structures would say we needed a campus in our area and without much review, if they had their way there would be a campus pop up here and a program pop up there. So there was seen as a need for some coordination of higher education. There also was the emergence of the--in college of the baby-boom generation and there were huge numbers of students seeking higher education and there needed to be a way to deal with that enrollment in a way that could be managed financially for the state. [06:16]

So, less we had the--what at the time was ingenious, really, the creation of the master plan which divided the segments of higher education into three different distinct groups of universities and colleges. You had the UC that was given the authority to do research and offer PhD's that was defined as their mission and they could recruit students from the top 1/8 of the high school graduation population. The CSU was a very loose collection of colleges with limited coordination and that group--the CSU was assigned and at that time it wasn't the CSU, it was the California State Colleges that had grown out of teacher preparation institutions. That group was assigned the top 1/3 of California high school graduates and our mission was to provide primarily undergraduate education and degrees through the master's degree but not the doctorate. And our research mission was permitted but it was supposed to stay within the framework of our primary focus on instruction. [07:44]

The third group is the California Community Colleges and they were given the additional assignment of accepting all additional high school graduates who could--who were capable of benefiting from a post high school instruction. Their--they were authorized to provide remedial instruction, to provide ESL courses, noncredit courses for adult instruction and workforce training which we now call CTE. And I'd like to quote from state law at that time because there was a very important aspect of what the master plan represented and has represented since then but as we say times are changing, but here is what it was in the '60s. The UC and the CSU are expected to plan that adequate space is available to accommodate all California resident students, all California resident students who are illegible and likely to apply to attend in appropriate place within the system. The state of California likewise reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure that resources are provided to make this expansion possible and shall commit resources to ensure that illegible students are accommodated in a place within the system. [09:23]

This commitment to access was an enormous commitment on the part of the state of California and was the base--really the basis of the master plan for education. Clarke Kerr who was one of the real

architects of that master plan stated in testimony in 1999 to the legislature that it was the first time in the history of any state in the United States or in any other nation in the world where such a commitment was made that a state or nation would promise that there would be place ready for every high school graduate or person otherwise qualified. [10:08]

There are a couple other provisions that I'll mention because when we think about change, there has been change taken place as other places in the master plan. The first is the mission of the community colleges to prepare students for transfer. It was envisioned by this separation of the three segments of higher education that they would not function in isolation, in their own silos but that they would be interactive parts of this higher education component and it was the role of the community colleges to provide for transfer to the UC or the CSU. [10:50]

And therefore, there was a lower division to upper division ratio established for what the students we could enroll in both the UC and the CSU of 40 to 60 ratio lower division to upper division and this would provide room for all those transfer students that would come to us. Other aspects of the master plan as designed, affordability and fees, President Koester has already addressed that basic component and it also created the Cal Grant program so that aid would be provided to ensure that needy and high performance students would have the ability to attend a California institution of higher education of their choice. It also enabled students to attend private universities and the thought on the part of the legislature was that would provide the needed space for all of this enrollment that they expected. [11:52]

So how has the master plan succeeded? It defined specific mission for each segment, it was groundbreaking in creating a system that combined quality with broad access. Broad access, we're saying over and over again broad access for students. Oh, my goodness. [Laughter] The MPE or the master plan was provided for a highly trained intellectually creative workforce. The challenge is for the present and future. Of course the declining financial support that's already been addressed. Preserving affordability for our students, declining de facto access without much public comment on that is just the money is not there or when the state is gonna cut money, guess where they cut? Budget reductions in the C--CCs and the CSU; these are the--what's identified in Sacramento as the broad access institutions and it is a particular group of student that has been hit the hardest by this decline in access brought on by the financial restrictions. [13:11]

The comment earlier about the preparation of high school students, it stated that only 25 percent of high school student, high school graduates are academically prepared for higher education and relatively few students benefit from the transfer opportunities that were central to the master plan. Less than 70,000 transferred to either the UC or CSU in 2007. This is probably part of the fact that the California consistently ranks in the bottom 1/3 among states who provide baccalaureate degree production. [13:55]

So where are we now? This--the master plan committee has made its--the final report and in that report they decided they needed to exist for another year but some of the statements in their final report are pretty critical for the things that we wanna be thinking about because there's change--they're still the same commitment to affordability and access but the language that they use is different, and let me pull a couple of those out since I'm losing my timing. The need for effective transfer, we had--it was stated in the meeting that our leadership had with Ira Ruskin who was the chair of the master plan committee. He said, there's two things that the CSU and the UC can do for us and that's improve transfer and provide for accountability and one statement that was made in regard to the financing of higher education,

California needs a sound financial mechanism aligned with state wide, aligned with state wide goals to ensure that our states needs our met and so that both level of public investment, and here is the key terminology, both the level of public investment and the return on investment articulated and verifiable. So this report emphasizes the needs for state wide identification of goals and accountability to meeting those goals and those goals inevitably are things that President Koester has already mentioned. They are quantifiable. It is the number of our graduates, the number of transfers, the elimination of the achievement gap. And I'll stop there. [15:53]

**STEPANEK:** Thank you, Barbara. Theresa.

**THERESA MONTANO:** First of all, let me thank you for the opportunity to talk to you this morning. As a member of two boards of directors for both the California Teachers Association and the California Faculty Association, and just finishing tenure from the National Education Association, and as a member of the president of this chapter and the Chicano Studies Department, I have to tell you I worked alongside some of the most phenomenal activists. I worked within three public sector unions and that's the topic that I'll talk about in closing. And I hope to bring that perspective to this dialog this morning. But most importantly, I wanna share with you with the CFA, your union is doing to meet the challenges and to sustain the integrity of the master plan. [16:48]

And I gotta tell you as I witness student tuition skyrocketing both here and across the world, faculty laid off for lack of funds, private for profit universities advertising how much better they teach than public higher education, and politicians furthering their political fortunes by rallying against public educators. I don't think of the positive message in Dylan's song "The Times They Are a-Changin'" but the words to masters of war. You hide behind walls. You hide behind desk. I just want you to know I can see through your mask. You've never done nothing but build to destroy. [17:30]

It's impossible to talk about what's happening in higher education without looking at the sociopolitical context in which we as faculty negotiate these changes. The present attempts to restructure higher education are a result of the set of policies that occur during the Reagan administration, where within 3 years of his administration, he established a corporate model of organization and operation set up to maximize profits and gain a competitive advantage in our colleges and universities. And these efforts are the basis for revamping the ways public universities and college set their priorities, create their budgets, and implement those policies. [18:17]

Today, these reforms are driven by a new set of profiteers often quite liberal in their ideology. Profiteers who are determined to worm their way into public education. In K12, they are Broad, Walton and Gates. In higher education, there are Illumina, Gates, and others. These groups of venture philanthropists are assisted in their quest often by groups of system heads like NASH, the National Association of System Heads, and AASCU, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Moreover, those for-profit corporations that President Koester spoke of today are also coming to the realization that there is money to be made in education. [19:10]

And the for-profit industry between 1998 and the 2008 grew 225 percent. Mind you, the majority of students still attend public higher education and many attend for profits for extra. So all is not lost if we really begin to think about what we're going to do with public higher education. And the proliferation of the for-profit colleges isn't limited to those outside of public universities but more and more, there is an

increasing reliance on for-profit education within our own institutions. Where instead of increasing pressure to increase the funding to public higher education, we begin to have dependence on public ventures or auxiliaries, public private partnerships, and financing special projects by private foundations. [20:06]

That's one area, particular concern for the CFA, particularly the use or the transparency of the profits made and academic programs funded through extension, the move of degree programs into extension, and the fees charged for online courses. And this year's CFA will be considering legislation on this matter. Not that we don't embrace the change or want to see that or effectively realize that this may happen, but then we want transparency and we want faculty decision making in that area. [20:43]

The push by private interest to promote its agenda and profits is accelerating during the current educational climate. And the decrease in funding is met with an increase in student tuition not only in this country but throughout the world. And on your tables, I left you a graph to see what's happening as we shift our funds away from public funding, whether it's a state or federal level, we've seen a huge, not small, the 242 percent increase in student funding since 2002. We're gonna see this year on a federal level with the new administration drastic cuts and funding in the house. And no one is discussing a bailout this year. [21:34]

In the state of California, the governor in his inaugural speech said that we were going to be looking at a draconian budget. And 3 days within his administration, he then unveiled a budget where he said K12 would not as they have in the past, take the brunt of the budget cuts, but that it would mean huge budget cuts for the higher education, both the CSU, this UC and community colleges. What was different though and should be noted is that this governor proposed a stakeholder group to discuss what would have to determine the specific mix of measures that can best accomplish these objectives. And now it includes students and faculty. From our perspective, the budgeter's budget proposal would reduce the CSU allocation to 2.29 billion dollars, 12 and a half percent less than the 2010, 2011 budget. And while this is a drastic cut, since the CSU board of trustees has seem to increasing student fees aggressively, the funds available to the CSU system would be 4.5 percent lower. [22:44]

And on your chairs, there's a handout that compares the budget of the past few years. The budget shows that the total funds proposed for the CSU in 2010, excuse me, 2011, 2012 exceed the budget through 2009, 2010 by 7.4 percent. And while we oppose student hikes, while we recognize the impact this budget is gonna have on the university, it's important to note that the operating budget has not been reduced to the 2009, 2010 levels where we got our furloughs. But it also, as the funds for higher education dwindle, institution is about policies that weaken the role of faculty. It's much more than belt tightening. What we're seeing in this country that tenure track faculty now represent only 30 percent of all the faculty in the country. [23:40]

The number of tenured faculty in the CSU has dropped by 570 this year. And while lecturers are--the number of lecturers are reduced because of layoffs and non-reappointments, what happens to tenure track is when we leave or we retire, we're not replaced. What that means if we're not cognizant of this is when economic times get better that many of those positions will become lecturer positions, which who are paid less, who are much easier to dismiss, and who have fewer rights than tenure track faculty. Plus, the role of academic disciplines is changing. And what we're seeing is the colleges hardest hit are the humanities, education, and social sciences. The worth of a discipline if we're not careful is going to be

dependent on how lucrative a position, faculty, our graduates attain when they leave us, we are seeing the restructuring and dismantling of ethnic studies programs, the destruction of humanities programs, and the reduction of modern languages to exchange programs. Do we want to change absolutely? Do we want elimination of the intellectual growth and the academic disciplines that the university has founded? Absolutely not. [25:05]

And for those of us who think that this value-added frenzy that's impacting K12 will not impact us, let me tell you Texas A&M this year will evaluate their professors and pay them according to how much research money they bring in and how much money they generate from teaching. Effective teacher education programs will be based on the scores of K12 students. These are very dangerous times when we start thinking about accountability. We're also real concerned about the plans coming from the chancellor's office, whether you call it red balloon, the graduation initiative or early start. We suspect that some of those reform efforts will severely impact students who come from the region. We're not opposed to change. We know it's inevitable. We have principles for those changes within these documents. And we understand that as we rally against punitive restructuring, people will point to us and say, you're anti-change, you're anti-innovation. The system is antiquated and you don't want to get on board. You don't want our students to graduate on time. You don't believe in high quality higher education and they can't be further from the truth. [26:20]

Finally, let me say that I understand that the only things standing in the way of reform and public education are labor unions, specifically public sector unions. We are conscious of the attacks that are due to because we are the strongest sector in the labor movement and that our agenda is incompatible with the political corporate establishment. But we should also understand that the union attack is not an attack on the union. They are undeniably attacks on your rights as faculty, on your pensions, on your tenure, on your academic freedom, and on your right to participate in the political agenda. We're hopeful. We have more discussion with the governor in a couple of months since he's been in the office than we've had before. We are working with public sector unions to form coalitions. We are launching the class action where we will have discussions on these issues on April 13. We know that what's--since this weekend, CFA will be engaged in a national dialogue with university and faculty from throughout the country, both union and non-union to talk about the future of public education. We're gonna be working on the legal front at the bargaining table and in the field to keep the public and public education because what we know is at stake here isn't what's good for our constituency but what's good for the state of California. [27:50]

**STEPANEK:** Thank you, Theresa.

[ Applause ]

**STEPANEK:** Next, Cynthia.

**CYNTHIA RAWITCH:** Thank you. I was 17 years old in 1964 when Bob Dylan recorded "The Times They Are a-Changin'". I played it incessantly to drive my parents crazy. They never even heard the word, they just couldn't stand his voice. That summer, I went to the Newport Folk Festival in Newport, Rhode Island and I saw him perform it live in front of 50,000 people. It was transformational for me. The song was an anthem but it was also both a call for and a prediction of revolution particularly for my generation. Hard to believe but I heeded the call. It's now a ring tone. [28:43]

[ Laughter ]

One of the differences between now and then besides my age, my weight, and my hair color, is the impetus for change. Then change was actively willed by the change makers. Proactive if you will. Now change is being forced upon us by the circumstances in which we find ourselves. It's reactive. But from my point of view, even when change is forced on us, we need to be as proactive as possible as much as possible as often as possible rather than let external forces overwhelm us. We need to scope out what's coming and act on it. Sometimes we will be wrong. Again, from my point of view, that is what we've been doing for the last 18 months at Cal State Northridge, forced to make change, we are selecting out those changes that will best benefit our current and future students. Sometimes we are wrong. Partly we have learned the result of this change is that change can be for the better even--even when we are taking to it kicking and screaming. Back for a minute to the younger Cynthia. I believe that the world was made of adversarial relationships. [30:01]

It's what I knew from the '60s and from being a reporter, but virtually all of the changes we've made at CSUN in the last 18 months worked because they were collaborative among faculty staff and administrators. Now most of you who have known me for a long period of time know that I hardly ever sound like happy instead of grumpy but I really do believe what I'm saying. I believe I used to know students very well when I was a faculty member. I don't anymore. But I do know that faculty and advisers have the insights I used to have and more. So we return to you for ideas and for implementation. Well, let me give you an example. An excellent one I believe. Stretch freshman writing, stretch was entirely faculty designed and implemented. All administration did, and that was me, was bring the idea to campus for consideration, fund the designers, fund the pilot, and recognize a great thing when it was handed back to us. So I believe the times are permanently changed. I think the good old days are never coming back and I'm not all that sure that all of them were good. But as I--I also truly believe we can make change work for us as long as we work together. So I'm hopeful that our current students can look back finally to these years and say these were their good old days. Thank you. [31:33]

[ Applause ]

**STEPANEK:** We'll now start our second round which is an opportunity for rebuttal and additional comments, so again we'll go to Barbara.

**SWERKES:** I would like to concur with my--with my colleagues in terms of the approach to how we deal with this change. It absolutely must be a collaborative effort and we need to embrace the ideas of our colleagues. Our conversations need to be collegial. We need to be informed but we need to move ahead. I suppose are my experiences and that's where I'd like to stop at this point. [32:20]

**STEPANEK:** Thank you, Theresa.

**MONTANA:** I just want to call attention to a couple of things that we passed out. I do believe that we're gonna have to engage in a collaborative and conservative dialogue about what's gonna happen to public higher education. I don't think we can do this in a vacuum. I don't think that the conversation should be limited to those of us who worked at CSUN. I think we--we pretty much at CSUN are quite lucky and that we do have a voice in some of the restructuring efforts. I think one of the things that happens though is that many times when we're on committees, and I'm glad to see that the academic

center is moving in this way. It--we--we don't continue the conversation and dialogue outside of the committee. So often we're representing our own voice, our own department within this and these--these changes are pretty--are pretty deep and--and pretty significant. So I want to call your attention, those of you who have it, a lot of what I said was in the thought and action. This is probably one of the best thought and actions I have seen coming out of the national education association in a long time. And I hope that those of us in higher education will have some influence on this. But there are two particular articles, one by Thomas [inaudible] and one from Teri Yamada who's at Cal State Long Beach that are excellent on what's happening. And it's a fall--yeah, right, the fall journal. And the other is to call your attention to the quality of higher education within the 21st century. One of the things that we're gonna be doing as I said is engaging in this national dialogue this weekend. It's very small group of folks. We're going to be extending it and moving forward on it. I'd like to get--personally I like to get your input on the draft principles so that your voices represent it. And then the other thing that I think that you need to pay--that hopefully you'll be paying attention to is we're gonna be having an online survey. One of the things that the governor has promised is that there will be faculty voice in what happens in the budget. That's significant. That is really significant this year. We never had that with his predecessor. We're gonna be putting on an online survey and asking our members to give us their ideas on what the budget cut should be. Both is the way for us to get an understanding of where you stand and also to make some very concreted proposals that are away from instruction and students. [34:53]

**STEPANEK:** Cynthia.

**RAWITCH:** I think that anything we do to engage in this conversation is an excellent move, whether it is union led, whether it is faculty governance led or whether it--you know, legislature, maybe not so much. We can't have everything, but the fact is that conversation is a global conversation. It's global universal or its global California. I will agree with Theresa when she says that on this campus, we have input and we have participation. It doesn't happen in other CSUs or elsewhere in the State of California. So, yes, I think we should have this ongoing conversation but I--I think that maybe because I'm realistic and my job is to make things happen that I'm also thinking we need to move in that direction while we think of ways that we could do it better.

**STEPANEK:** Thank you from our panelists. What we'd like to do now is open it up for questions from the floor. What we're going to do is request that you raise your hand and Michael over here will select somebody, come running to you with the microphone and then please speak in to the mic.

[ Pause ]

**LOU RUBINO:** I am Lou Rubino from health sciences department. I wanted to make some comments regarding the competitive statements almost that were made regarding extended learning and how--that we need to think of them as more of our partner and not as our competitor in the sense that they're much more efficient in a lot of ways. They appeal to jobs, placements with the students. The programs oftentimes may appear to be more expensive but ours in particular are cost effective compared to the deal but also the fact that due to the way of delivery, it actually is less expenses sometimes for the students. And unless we're gonna go the way of like health care with public and private not collaborating, we'll be forced into some kind of national reform plan. And so I just wanted to comment about that.



**MONTANO:** Let me clarify that again. CSUN, the way that we work with extended learning differs from CSU to CSU. So we recognize that when classes get--develop an extended learning in at CSUN, it's different. On the other hand--and we're not opposed to extended learning. We're not opposed to online. We are concerned though with what extended learning has historically been and at this point, we're looking for transparency within the budgets of extended learning. So that it--it benefits the departments as much as it does the extended learning community. [37:37]

**RUBINO:** But with transparency, you'll find out that a lot of the revenue is shared and it goes back to the state support side and so they should be our partner.

**MONTANO:** Right.

[ Pause ]

[ Inaudible Remark ]

**STEPANEK:** Other questions?

[ Pause ]

**RAWITCH:** I don't see you running, Mike.

[ Laughter]

**RAWITCH:** Much better.

**JARED RAPPAPORT:** Hi! So, specifically where do you see the points of optimism coming out of this? And I hear Theresa you said that this new governor even though with this billion dollar budget cut, he is listening to us but--so what are the optimistic points we have to take into this now?

**MONTANO:** The optimistic points?

**RAPPAPORT:** Yeah, I meant--this is addressing all of, all of you. [38:27]

**MONTANO:** Well I mean I do--there--this--again when I look at optimism and I look at the direction, I have to look at not just what's happening at CSUN but what's happening globally within the public higher education community. I do see, I do--I am optimistic about the--the new governor and his transparency and his willingness to listen to the voice of faculty and students. But I'm also optimistic about the fact that I see both here and within the country, and abroad, the faculty beginning to say, wait a minute. You know, wait a minute, just hold on a second. We want a voice in what you're doing here and that there are certain things that are integral to the way that public universities function that we want to make sure that there is. So I see some--I'm optimistic about the activism and the role of the faculty here in--in California as well as what's happening abroad globally. This is not just a California issue. It is an issue throughout this country and throughout the world. I have the same conversation with Canadian colleagues so-- [39:35]

**RAWITCH:** I think the optimism extends from what I know about this campus, changes we've made, I think I'm optimistic for the CSU system. I'm not talking about the global picture because the ideas that are born here or that are created here or--or discussed here often go the way to larger area that the provost and the president are both extraordinarily well respected in the CSU system.

And so ideas that are--that come--that are--that are started here or are expanded here often go out and are taken up by other CSU campuses. I think that's the reason for optimism. I think it's a reason for optimism that we are as best we can continuing to admit students and offer them courses and help them move to the degree that they want. It may not be to a degree that 17-year-old Cynthia wanted in 1964 but it is their futures that we're helping to work with. I think that's all very optimistic and I think that that kind of change along with the larger global changes are very important for--for us in California and for us in higher education. [40:54]

[ Pause ]

**STEPANEK:** While you're thinking about the next question, I'll ask one. So keep thinking. As President Koester happened to comment, if you watch any of what we call the traditional TV channels in the evening, it doesn't have to be real late, you inevitably run across various commercials for virtual and near virtual campuses that promise a new career and a degree in like 18 months. Are they a competition for us? [41:28]

[ Pause ]

**MONTANO:** Absolutely they're a competition. They're our biggest competition. But even though that's happening, we still have the largest number of students. And I think that's hopeful but yeah, they--they most certainly are our competition. [41:44]

**STEPANEK:** Others?

**SWERKES:** I would concur I saw a presentation given by the research folks at the California Community Colleges that showed that more and more of their transfer students are moving to the University of Phoenix. They're clearly are competition but one of the things that is beginning to change is the conversation about the value of all of these privates that offer both K12 type of education as well as higher education and they're finding that students who enrolled do not graduate. Their record at least is--is not equal to ours and that students who attend these colleges since they are for profit, their fees are very high and the students have large amounts of federal and state grant support. And these students are the students who default more frequently on their loans. So those messages are beginning to get to legislators and there may be changes coming in--in their ability at least to compete. We have to believe in the value of the product that we have to offer. And we might do a little bit our job of getting the word out in terms of what it is that we have to offer, and work more closely with our colleagues in particular since we accept so many transfer students. We accept that in the CSU, we accept more students and transfer than any other institution in the state. And we need to work more closely with our colleagues in the community colleges to help those students be successful and move in our direction. [43:53]

**STEPANEK:** Questions unless you're gonna force me to have to ask another one. Okay, I will. Barbara and others, but basically comments you were just making about part SB 1440 and other sorts of

endeavors. It's very exciting what's going on for those but in our hard economic times, can that create a situation between the community colleges and the CSU of it being in a sense, two-tier, you take your lower division at the community college. You come and do upper division here and that's it. That in a sense we don't take freshman anymore, are we at risk of anything like that? [44:34]

**SWERKES:** There is still the emphasis on the 40-60 allocation of students to the--both the CSU And the UC. And that really has not changed since the '60s. Our ratio, I inquired about that at the chancellor's office last year and we still are maintaining that--that close to 40 percent freshman relative to the 60 percent of our upper division number of students, so I don't see that changing. It hasn't changed in degree amount of time and it's really--it depends on how students perceive what it is they need to do and what they want to do and when they make the decision what it is they want to do. The students we see is freshmen usually are a little more focused than students that attend the community colleges at first and they get a little more time to orient themselves and make decisions. [45:45]

**RAWITCH:** I don't see anything in the current 1440 legislation or on how it's being implemented through the community colleges with CSU as a junior partner. I don't know how to quite describe the language of junior partner that would suggest that in the short term or even in the middle distance that we're going to become a primarily upper division that we would not be admitting freshmen. The idea would be of course that if a student chooses to start a new community college that that period of time is not wasted then it counts toward they're finishing a bachelor's degree when they come here, but I don't see it as--I don't see it as a threat so far to anything that we're doing here. [46:28]

**STEPANEK:** Okay. We have a question from the floor.

**WAYNE SMITH:** My name is Wayne Smith and I have a question. I spent some of my time trying to do fundraising for my community college alma mater and in the several million dollar range here in Los Angeles Community College district. And this particular community college when the budget cuts hit last year, they cut immediately all sports except for women's volleyball. This is after 75 years of a--except for women's volleyball because it started early in August or something like that. Can I ask all four of you, if you were to cut something, anything, it's meant to be athletics if appropriate? If there was something you personally would like to see go--[laughter] By the way I'm asking this question 'cause, I don't know, I thought it was an interesting question and I'm asking this question 'cause I've been in the CSU system almost 30 years now and I'm not sure how I'd answer that question either. And by the way, the reason I asked that is because I wouldn't have guessed that a university would cut every single athletic program just clean before they cut other things and they cut a few other things as well. I wouldn't have guessed that and I've thought I would know. I should know what a place would cut because I have experience I guess but I don't know that. [47:56]

**MONTANO:** Well, I can tell you what my colleague said last weekend at the union meeting. I'll tell you one thing that--that we have to really take a look at in terms of budget cuts and one is we have to really approach this restructuring effort by looking at that. But that's why we're asking and some of it is going to be--I mean [inaudible] when Governor Brown cut the cell-phones of the state employees, when he looked at the state budget, that was very little of the state budget but it was symbolic in--in what he was looking at and that we had to look at every single thing. And so we we're having this conversation last weekend and Cecile was there, so she can verify this. And some of the things that colleagues were saying were like car allowances for administration but no one really knew exactly what to, you know,

other than that, there were other things that came up. I can't remember what they were but the discussion was, we need to let the faculty have a say so on this and that's why we're doing the budget survey. [49:09]

**RAWITCH:** I think the business--

**MONTANO:** But it wasn't sports and it wasn't academics. Faculty were really clear that whatever budget cuts would happen, would happen away from the classroom.

**RAWITCH:** Wayne, I think the business college would be where I would cut.

**SMITH:** There we go. Now you got it.

[ Laughter ]

**RAWITCH:** The--the fact is I don't think on this campus we're thinking at all about wholesale slaughter of taking out a specific area or discipline or athletics as much as we're trying to finesse enough so that kind of wholesale what would you get rid off if you have the power doesn't--doesn't have to happen that we might--my opinion. [49:51]

**MONTANO:** But it has happened on other campuses.

**RAWITCH:** Yeah, that's true.

**STEPANEK:** Yeah. We have a certain--

**SMITH:** Thank you.

**STEPANEK:** Economy of scale that allows us to better be able to maintain the broad variety of different programs we have but if you at all listen to some of the stories from some of our smaller sister campuses, they have gone through some rather significant cuts of programs and staffing. [50:14]

Additional questions? We have time for maybe another one or two if there are. You're a shy group this morning. Let me see. I'll look at my list.

Wayne has another one. Go for it.

**SMITH:** I have met Jerry Brown on a couple of occasions. One of them, not a pleasant one but that's okay, I'll leave that here. But he is not his father, that is for sure and I think he went to Berkeley. Somebody can check me on that if I'm not mistaken. What--if--if he came here as a student in our MBA program or extended learning program, what one class would you require him to take? The opposite question from the one I just asked?

**MONTANO:** I think he should take a Chicano Studies course.

[ Laughter ]

**RAWITCH:** Excellent answer. Chicano Studies class.

**MONTANO:** Just kidding.

**STEPANEK:** Should he take his or should he take any business classes though?

**SMITH:** Yes. Definitely. Including with the ones we don't teach like micro finance and new ways of thinking about financial modeling that hasn't permeated most of state government.

**RAWITCH:** I would suggest a special seminar constructed for him on the historical perspectives of Jerry Brown I. [51:36]

**MONTANO:** I think the danger and I--and this is something we had talked about before about narrowing the number of courses that our students take is that--and we think back when you were 18 years old, right, 17, 18, when you first entered a college or university. Many times the courses that we took were courses that we were curious about. I mean is--of course you took your GEs but you also took courses that you think well maybe I wanna major in this, maybe I wanna look at this. I think part of what happens when you go to college and universities is you have a chance to really think about and reflect on what you wanna do and many of--much of that time is gonna be spent going around from department to department taking courses. I don't think that curiosity in our students has changed. Whether it's community college or the CSU or the UC, many of our students are thinking about what they're gonna do. So when we narrow the number of courses and when we crunch it into like you need a certain number of units or you're out, we also in my opinion squashed some of that curiosity. [53:03]

**STEPANEK:** Cecile.

**CECILE BENDAVID:** Cecile Bendavid. While we're talking about the students, this past semester we enrolled the largest freshman class we have ever had. With our budget constraints, are we going to be able to offer classes to those students as they continue into the sophomores and so on?

**RAWITCH:** Yes, for this spring. Most assuredly as best we can in future years. We admitted them and I do believe that we have a moral certitude that we must now give them the opportunity that we offered them. It might not look the way we would have preferred it to look 15 years ago but I think by and large, we will be able to help these students to the degree that they're seeking. [53:56]

**SWERKES:** I might end that that's one of the problems that the community colleges are clearly facing right now since they have open enrollment. Any student who knocks on their door is admitted and because of the budget cuts, they are--the community colleges are experiencing drastic cut backs in faculty and sections of courses, so students expect to be enrolled and cannot find the classes and this was one of the major discussions at statewide senate as we begin facing the current budget restrictions because many of us remembered the early '90s when we had major cut backs and we did have many students walking the halls trying to find. We admitted students but then we didn't have the dollars to offer the class sections. I think we've learned from that but there needs to be something happening in the community colleges for those students who expect that they're going to be able to complete their programs. But what's--what they described right now is happening in community colleges is a swirling

where students are not attached to any one campus but they go to all of the local campuses, especially in an area like ours where there are many, many community colleges that they can choose from and get to reasonably I guess considering the traffic in the LA area but they have lots of choices of campuses of the community colleges and they take one course here and another course here, kind of like our part time faculty. They go from one place to another and try to find courses that they can--that they can use to complete their programs. [55:51]

**STEPANEK:** We have one or two more questions. I know we have--you have a question? Yeah. Go on.

**JON STAHL:** John Stahl. Following up on the fact that we had such robust admissions, this academic year looking ahead, is it too early to predict or guess how the likely budget cuts will affect the admissions picture of our next academic year? [56:20]

**RAWITCH:** Budget or not, there will be a more restrained admission of freshmen in--for fall of 2011. Transfer students we don't normally impact in any way. That is our first requirement is to serve transfer students, but we are looking at numbers of ways to have a smaller freshman class and more reasonable freshman class and one that we can serve well for this coming fall. [56:51]

**STEPANEK:** Any question upfront?

**TERRI LISAGOR:** Terri Lisagor, Family & Consumer Science and yes, I think I am a little shy to ask this question or hesitant maybe. I have never been known as shy. My question--I was just speaking to a young man, really bright, very impressive, educated in the United States but recruited to a smaller country and his job was to go out because the times there are changing everywhere in the world. The--what is needed in industry for our graduates is very different and--and the president addressed that, we've addressed that. His job is to evaluate all of the job potentials that are there in their country and see--and he's coordinating with the universities to see how education can best meet the needs of what is predicted to be the change of job market. Are we doing anything like that? I mean I'm sure the answer is yes. I think. I hope. [58:05]

**RAWITCH:** I think it's interesting because often that is brought to us by the students themselves and they will say, you know, I want to be an X and I need you to help me learn how to be an X, whatever X is. And over time, I think students coming to us, perhaps industry coming to us with specific skills. My opinion is that it is not changing overall the point or the purpose of a bachelor's degree and that we still believe in a broad general education and we are--my opinion, again, we're not being designed by industry to solve the need for industry to have-- [58:52]

**STEPANEK:** More person.

**MONTANO:** And I think that's absolutely true. I think that whatever "profession" that one goes to, one needs to be well rounded and I think that that--that I am so happy to hear that 'cause that is absolutely one of the concerns that at least the folks who are coming to the national conversation this weekend are having. [59:17]

**STEPANEK:** Well, it's time for us to start to close this particular panel

[ Simultaneous Talking ]

**STEPANEK:** Oh, I'm sorry. By all means. I'm sorry [inaudible].

**SWERKES:** --to the comment because I had some quotes that I didn't share from the report from the master plan review committee that was submitted last July and one statement that they made was that we need quality in higher education and their definition of quality was revolved around those capacities and skills that are essential for preparing Californians to live and work constructively in the 21st century. That was part of my intent in sharing what's happening with the master plan and we still are committed to the same kinds of basic principles but the language that we used to describe how we go about doing it is changing and--and workforce requirements are a major part of that as far as the legislature is concerned and they do have some control of our purse strings. [60:28]

**STEPANEK:** This is not the end of this discussion. It's in reality just the beginning. This afternoon, there is going to be another panel at 1 o'clock which is on Responding to Change: Visions of the Road Ahead. [60:44]

==== Transcribed by Automatic Sync Technologies ====