CHAPTER 8

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, ACCOUNTABILITY, SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY – THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A CASE STUDY

Fabienne-Sophie Chauderlot

ABSTRACT

Despite millions of dollars funding increases in the California Community College system, statistics show that less than 50% of students complete their two-year degree in six years. The 114 colleges that serve over two million students have, therefore, been mandated to implement student success programs under the Chancellor's Vision for Success strategy. Dr. Ortiz Oakley's plans to decrease attrition and graduation time while improving equity entail additional responsibilities for the instructors because one of its measures ties a percentage of funding to quantifiable increases in success rates. Such connection was one of the reasons for a no confidence motion voted against the Chancellor by the Faculty Association. Though circumscribed, this case calls attention to the general question of accountability in the classroom. Can instructors be held responsible for students passing their classes? In face of rates of failure that are rare in other professional fields and unacceptable given Community College students' vulnerability and the vital importance of degrees to enter the workforce and earn living wages, this chapter examines how weaving a social justice component into instructors' mission of knowledge dissemination leads to the constitution of a beneficial civil society but generates conflict among the Colleges' leaders.

Leadership Strategies for Promoting Social Responsibility in Higher Education
Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning, Volume 24, 113–125

ISSN: 2055-3641/doi:10.1108/S2055-364120200000024011

Keywords: Academic leadership; civil society; two-year colleges; California Community Colleges; equity; social justice; accountability in education; student success; public education finance; organizational change

On May 10, 2019, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) Board of Governors issued a vote of no confidence in the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). The President of the statewide professional organization intended to reject two measures implemented by Chancellor Ortiz Oakley (Westman, 2019).

The114 Community Colleges form the largest system of higher education in the United States with more than 2.3 million duplicate students.[1] Community Colleges are one of the three types of public higher education systems in California, as summarized in Table 1.

Colleges are structured around the principle of shared governance that grants tremendous autonomy and control to the faculty. This vote of no confidence encapsulates the deadlock in which Community Colleges' educational leaders (deans, vice-presidents, and presidents) can find themselves when contemplating organizational changes that require the collaboration of faculty leaders (senate and union presidents). A research brief from the College Board in 2016 describes challenges with which the system is grappling nationwide:

> Although community colleges provide easy access for students, the majority of students in this sector do not complete a credential, and completion rates have been stagnant. Many students in this sector arrive underprepared academically, and many need developmental courses before they can study at the college level. Community college students tend to be older and to have family obligations, to enroll part time, and to work while in school. All of these factors create challenges for college success. (p. 21)

Table 1. California Public Higher Education Systems – Academic Year 2016–2017.

	Community Colleges, CC	State of California University, CSU	University of California, UC
Number of campuses	114	23	10
Number of students (duplicated)	2,300,000	480,000	238,000
State funding per student	$8,000	$15,000	$24,000
Tuition cost per year for full time student	$864	$6,500	$13,000
Years of studies	First 2 years	4 years	4 years + Post Graduate
Highest degrees	Associate's CTE Certificates Master's in 15 colleges	Master's Doctorate in Education, Nursing and Physical Therapy	Master's All Doctorates

Notes: Summary from the Foundation of California Community Colleges' web site at www.foundationccc.org, the California State University Chancellor's Office at https://www2.calstate.edu/, and the University of California website at https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/

Given such factors, the completion and transfer rates of Community Colleges in California are shockingly low. The Community College Review (Chen, 2018) summarizes research conducted by the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy. It found that 70% of students fail to obtain a degree or transfer to a four-year institution and drop out with large amounts of debt in spite of low-cost tuitions and financial aid availability. There is also a large disparity between minority and Caucasian students: only 22% of Latinx and 26% of African American students earn a two-year degree or certification within 6 years, whereas 35% of their Asian Pacific Islanders and 37% of their Caucasian classmates do. The failure for colleges therefore involves academic efficiency as well as social justice. According to the Community College Foundation, these rates have been steady for decades and "accelerating student completion and transfer rates" requires "a widespread reform effort led by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to promote student success and completion from inception to implementation."

Since his arrival in December 2016 at the head of the CCC Office, Chancellor Ortiz Oakley has focused on implementing system wide strategies for students to join the California workforce that needs 40% more of Bachelor's graduates to sustain the state's economic development and position as sixth world largest GDP economy. Behind Chancellor Ortiz Oakley's ambition is also his lifelong drive to reduce a perturbing 20% poverty rate that is disturbingly above an already shameful national average of 15%. The Chancellor's *Vision for Success* gathers programs to increase success and equity under one strategic plan that intends to "make sure students from all backgrounds succeed in reaching their goals and improve their families and communities." The rationales provided for the new programs are somber, for instance:

- Most students who enter a Community College never complete a degree or certificate or transfer to a four-year university.
- California's public education system is not producing nearly enough educated graduates to meet future workforce needs.
- The students who do reach their educational goal such as a degree or transfer take too long to do so and accumulate excess and useless credits.
- Older and working students are often left behind in the system due to lack of services and financial aid suiting their particular needs.
- Though fees and tuitions are minimal and most students have waivers and grants, education is more expensive than it seems both to students and taxpayers because of length (an average of six years to complete a two-year degree) therefore need for extended financial aid.

The plan's executive summary (Vision for Success, n.d.-b) further highlights that serious and stubborn achievement gaps persist among students from the different groups and among colleges in various locations.

The Colleges are tasked to achieve six daring goals and ambitious targets between 2017 and 2022 to meet California's needs.[2] Colleges have always worked very hard at reducing challenges and obstacles for their students. However, while Chancellor

Ortiz Oakley's quantitative approach facilitates the work of the trustees and corporate partners of the CCCCO in the State capital, it is at odds with the academic function and the nature of the problems. On one hand, the Chancellor's language and guidelines are that of the legislature, and they require profound adjustments in a very short time given the slow pace in academic change. On the other hand, faculty are on the front line of the hardships they see their students endure daily, and they know all too well that there is an undeniable urgency. Instructors remain, however, often at a loss to provide the range of strategies needed by the hundreds of students they teach every year. The additional burden of tracking and trending their own efficiency was therefore bound to provoke a reaction. The Chancellor's solution is rational and pragmatic, but perilous in terms of managing a radical reform. The Faculty Association's vote of no confidence comes as a stark reminder of the leadership duality within shared governance.

Community Colleges are governed by locally elected boards and managed under the bilateral oversight of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Association, and that of the college administrators (California Community Colleges Classified Senate (4CS), 1999).[3] Such a "social system of self-government," as Schuetz (1999) calls it, is designed for everyone sharing in the responsibility of educating others, whether faculty, staff, or administrators, to make joint decisions. Exercising this model, however, does not go without dilemmas. In a humorous article entitled "How To Climb Down From Top-Down Leadership," Rob Jenkins and Jensen (2010), instructor turned dean, and Beth Jensen summarized the predicament:

> At community colleges, just as at four-year institutions, a wide range of governance models exist, including those that claim to be shared governance but aren't, those that don't even pretend to be shared governance, and, occasionally, truly shared governance.

Written from the faculty's perspective, the article shows how rare the sharing is because administrators are not "willing to cede some of their authority to faculty members, who after all are the experts when it comes to academic matters." The Title 5 California Administrative Code 53200 and 53202 explicitly defined such expertise, known in the system as the 10 + 1.[4]

An opposite reason for the rarity of truly shared governance is retraced by Robert Shireman. A higher education policy expert from the Obama and Clinton Administrations, and senior fellow at the Century Foundation,[5] his administrator's viewpoint (Shireman, 2013) is that the authority "actually conferred on academic senates" radically differs from the interpretation of the faculty. For him and Livingston (1998), AB 1725[6] only delegated faculty hiring to faculty senates. Originally, it did not extend to the Title 5 "10+1" college issues. These "ten broad zones of authority," and the 11th even broader "other," would have been "dreamed up later by faculty group lobbyists and then adopted by the system Board of Governors in 1990." For Shireman, "academic senates were given vast, unprecedented powers that the legislature never intended them to have, formal authority beyond that of any other academic senate in the country." From that perspective, governance is not shared either because it has been appropriated by faculty. Representing 9,500 of the about 18,000 faculty, the FACCC is very strong and its mission, per its website, is to "strengthen the position of faculty in the

State Capitol, the State Chancellor's Office, and the State Teachers' Retirement System" (FACCC, n.d.). Indeed, as Reed describes the sharing process in his witty *Confessions of a Community College Administrator* (2013):

> Back when the faculty were the college, the idea of shared governance was relatively straightforward: the faculty would run the college as a committee of the whole, only occasionally delegating authority over dreary operational issues to administrators, who were understood to be something like secretaries. If you push some faculty advocates of shared governance into a corner, you'll find that they still think this way. (p. 81)

Whatever the dynamics may be, faculty, staff, and administrators working in the Community Colleges have the same desire: to see more students remain in school and graduate faster. Still, systemic characteristics generate built-in conflicts of interest like the FACCC resolution that came after months of tense negotiations between the Chancellor's Office and the colleges. The Faculty Association concluded that the steps will "harm students and provide a low return on investment" (Westman, 2019). As examples of risks, the commentary cites the new fully online college and the new funding formula. The vote of no confidence comes as a loud signal that the Chancellor, who promised "to wake up every morning and push in the direction that I think is best for our students, our state, and our nation," has pushed too far (Arnett, 2017).

It is only the second time in the 66-year history of the FACCC and the century-long process of transformation of the CCCs that such a drastic measure has been taken even though the colleges have a long history of animated relationships between faculty and administrators. Additionally, this particular repudiation comes at a time when higher education in the United States is under the attack of complex and formidable political, financial, and economic forces. It would, therefore, behoove both administrators and teachers to set aside policy differences to focus on strengthening the system as a whole because Community Colleges predominantly serve the members of the American society who are in dire need of an education. Young students from the lowest socio-economic status; immigrants and refugees who do not speak English; adults without much prior, if any, schooling seeking to upgrade their skills to feed their families; and all desperately need the Colleges' instructional and support services. Beyond certificates and degrees, Colleges also offer a nurturing environment for people of all ages with developmental, mental, physical, and other challenges such as substance addiction sufferers, previously incarcerated young adults, foster youth, veterans transitioning to civil life or incapacitated by various injuries.

Educators who choose to teach in Community Colleges are thus constantly confronted to the fundamental lack of social justice in the United States. As a result of the Trump administration, the inequality in chances of success among the groups that form the American diversity has worsened. California Community Colleges (CCC) have launched numerous initiatives such as the Undocumented Student Action Week in October 2019 to provide "sanctuaries," campuses that are safe and welcoming to all who seek to learn, because they see equity on par with academic performance as their mission. Every program seeks to "tackle the achievement gap" and "mitigate disproportionate impact" (Todd, Holcroft, & Evett, 2014). Even though, as Nevarez and Wood (2010) show, there may be a "dissonance

between the divisions of academic and student affairs," faculty, counselors, along with staff and administrators, systematically integrate equity in their objectives. Why, then, the repudiation of the Chancellor's plan? In a labor landscape that has seen a long-term erosion since the 1970s, Community College Faculty, like staff to a lesser degree but contrary to most administrators, are supported by proactive unions that secure valuable benefits, in addition to a tenure that provides a quasi-total job security and is a unique luxury in a country with little, if any, employment protection. The *Vision for Success* can be seen as a threat to some of these advantages because it demands structural and behavioral reforms. While the Chancellor focuses on measures to facilitate students' experience, the Faculty Association leaders' focus is to push back reforms that may negatively impact the instructors. As Evan Hawkins, the Executive Director of FACCC, told EdSource, the multi-media education platform in the State of California, his intention was to "send a message loud and clear" (Gordon, 2019).

The fifth guideline in the *Vision for Success*, for instance, recommends that everyone took ownership of students' performance which is different from simply professing. If faculty are required to ensure students' success as measured in increase of certificates, degrees, or units to carry over to a university, and decrease of time to graduation, their responsibility is decupled. Reasons for Community College students' failure are numerous and often out of educators' control. For example, to focus on success and equity, programs were created to fund the creation of pantries that stock snacks, or basic hygiene necessities because an increasing number of students live in precarious conditions. Hardships that undermine classroom performance reach well beyond the role of higher education institutions and statistics are alarming: nearly 20% of Community College students in California are homeless or couch-surfing, while 42% of Community College students nationwide are food insecure (Goldrick-Rab, Richardson, ownership, thus accountability, in terms of student success Schneider, Hernandez, & Cady, 2018). Faculty who are Counselors deploy endless creativity and kindness to palliate to the impact of such conditions on academic success increasing equity. But discipline faculty's traditional role was to transmit technical skills or prepare the highest achievers to transfer to four-year universities and their ownership, thus accountability, in terms of student success was not quantified previously, much less empirically formalized. The "*Vision for Success*" mandate of State employees to "move the needle" (Linderman & Kolenovic, 2013) points to an evolution in instructors' responsibility from lecturing large classrooms to producing large numbers of successful students. This shift is monitored by the CCCCO system-wide quantitative apparatus in search of solutions to problems that were before left to the qualitative approaches of college and individual instructors. Because many numbers, measures, metrics, and other key performance indicators are required from Community Colleges, the concept of "ac-count-ability" takes on a corporate meaning of counting what is actually produced. In academia however, such literal application begs questions that are both epistemological and ethical.

From the perspective of epistemology, one must wonder if teachers are responsible for their students' learning in their classes, or if liability is simply beyond the art of teaching. Even the most engaged means of instruction, the elenctic style, does not place the responsibility of getting to the truth on Socrates. Teaching is to

share knowledge, and learning, measured in grades, is the result; but any teacher knows there is no direct causality between instructors' professional activity and an A, B, C, or an F. Ethically though, if one postulates that education is not only a Maslowian aspiration but also a fundamental right, as proclaimed in Article 26 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then responsibility is at the core of teaching as much as expertise and transmission. Responsibility in professional environments means producing the result intended in one's craft or job description. The "product" of the educational activity is codified by student learning outcomes definitions and assessment; yet, if teachers' job descriptions required a certain number of passing grades, the very academic freedom that is fundamental to intellectual exercises and the educational contract would implode. Indeed, a common argument when faculty critique metrics is the risk of being forced to lower their academic standards. For centuries, the Western education system has put the responsibility of knowing on the teacher, and that of learning on the student. Teachers have de facto not been held accountable for the deliverable of their craft which, logically, should be 100% of successful students. Associating 20% of the yearly funding to grades, percentages, and ratios is therefore a revolutionary move, and it led to a revolt. Indeed, Community College students' challenges; the disparity between the high schools they graduate from – or not; socio-economic backgrounds ranging from a level of poverty to a level of wealth one as obscene as the other; and a myriad of other factors impact the agency of instructors in a way that defies both skills and logic. But the accountability question is stubborn. If we have indeed progressed beyond the "student deficiency" model that gave the profession blanket immunity since Socrates was accused of corrupting the young, who then is responsible when students fail?

With the spreading of the student-centered learning concept in the past 30 or so years, the reform has gradually materialized the catchy slogan "from sage on the stage to guide on the side," as well as generated a plethora of outcome assessment theories, methodologies, and enterprise size software applications that produce benchmarks, targets, metrics, outputs, and institutional effectiveness data to make the management of learning clearer and easier to report to the State. Learning is tracked and trended at the most granular level, disaggregated, compared, and contrasted, still the needle is not climbing. Teaching itself, however, remains resistant from the analytical accounting that permeates all campus activities, as if impervious to scientific measures or predictive analytics. In fact, correlating teaching with learning can be dicey for administrators and often anathema to instructors. Yet if one considers that social responsibility comes with teaching underprivileged students, then teaching is the last frontier to explore, and this renders an instructor-centered systematic commitment antagonistic to a systemic student-centered instruction.

The reasons for the vote of no confidence highlights that tug of war tension in the middle of which students are caught (Westman, 2019), as well as "the age of accountability" which Cohen mentions (as cited in Robillard, 2000, p. 51): "has opened as legislators and taxpayer groups are asking, 'How are educators spending our money?'" Academic economics has become a major concern across the country, and the modification in the colleges' funding formula reflects the trend.

For the first time in the system's history, making twenty percent of the budget dependent on the coupling of student success with instructor deliverables signifies a fundamental paradigm shift in the evaluation of the successful performance of instructors. Currently it takes the form of a collegial and reciprocal peer review, every few years. Instructors de facto work in an honor system because, in number of Colleges, Deans' role in evaluation, promotion, tenure, or discipline is constrained within the Faculty Association collective bargaining agreement. Students must therefore rely on their instructors' personal sense of responsibility. While the vast majority of instructors do not need oversight to be deeply committed to their mission, by nature the system is permissive. Once student success becomes tied to funding, focus on classroom practices is bound to increase.

Community College students, however, are often as challenging for instructors as they are challenged themselves. Many have been deprived of the quality of schooling necessary to progress at a normal rate of teenage, then adult, education. According to the statistics that CCCCO publishes on scorecards[7], it is estimated that 43% of students are first-generation higher education seekers. They do not know how to navigate the system. At best their parents cannot help them, at worst they dread pursuing studies that delay earning and cost money for their families. Additionally, powerful groups in the country benefit from vast educational disparities among citizens. The cost of degrees has been made prohibitive, and the threat of massive debts is currently used to discourage middle- and lower-classes youths from getting a higher education. The message is clear: if you need loans to afford a hundred thousand dollar diploma, you are better off giving up since your earnings will never allow you to repay it. The argument is hard to counteract when 45 million borrowers have accumulated a record $1.5 trillion student loan debt in 2019. Community College instructors are therefore faced with students with many tragedies, few hopes, sometimes further alienated by still stigmatizing race and identity markers such as disabilities, gender, or sexual orientation. Often powerless, instructors' reactions range on a continuum from kind-hearted, compassionate, cultural competent altruism to authoritarian egotism and minimalism. On these campuses, everyone's task is Sisyphean. For instructors, it means teaching 5 classes per term, with 30 or more individuals with diverse backgrounds, drastically different levels of academic preparation, age, study skills, time for homework, mastery of the English language, and traumas from previous classroom or life experience. Pedagogy then requires not only prodigious talent and colossal work, but also unflagging devotion. In contrast, the Student Centered Funding Formula further makes them accountable for their students' remaining in and passing their classes, and potentially deprives them of 20% of funding if they have to give failing grades. After months of transactional discussions with the colleges, and vigorous debates with the Faculty Association, Chancellor Ortiz Oakley's reform, intended to decrease student attrition and failure, is received as a means to increase faculty efficiency. Instructors are well aware of data like the dramatic conclusions from the Stanford Center on Poverty that:

> over the last 30 years, wage inequality in the United States has increased substantially, with the overall level of inequality now approaching the extreme level that prevailed prior to the Great Depression. ("20 Facts," 2011)

The phenomena and forces that draw fractures among groups of the US society are complex. Results however are visible in plain sight. They all point to an increasing inability for fast-growing number of Americans to afford undergraduate education, much less graduate degrees. In parallel, the increase in jobs demanding degrees reinforces professional inequity, and perpetuates the social injustice that plague the groups that form the diversity in Community College students.

The concept of diversity has evolved from designating multicultural races to include social, economic, but also age, abilities, sexual identities, religions as well as factors like veteran status, youth in the foster system, or incarceration for instance. Faculty, staff, and administrators across institutions incorporate means of closing the achievement gaps between these groups and the best performing ones by rethinking pedagogy, innovating with technology, and identifying exclusion perpetuating practices. To support these efforts, following the report of September 2016 (Second Progress Report on the Student Success Act of 2012, 2016), $472 million were distributed to the Colleges under the Student Success and Support Program (The 2015–2016 Budget, 2015). Focusing on "equity" means devising support and instructional tactics to compensate for disadvantages built in their diverse identities. It is contrasted with the previous "equality" model which promoted giving everyone the exact same support regardless of needs. Equity entails developing and implementing a series of "wrap-up" services that address needs specific to the diverse groups that are disproportionally impacted because of their belonging to one population or the other. Such services include additional counseling tailored to Hispanic or African-American students for instance, transportation vouchers for students of lower socio-economic status, engagement centers for undocumented students, etc.

Understandingly, such a massive undertaking for colleges that are already disadvantaged in the California higher education systems is daunting. By making students and faculty the two sides of the same success coin, the Chancellor's twenty percent funding requires instructors to master non-academic components. Cultural competence can help instructors free their classrooms from discourses, assignments, examples, and more unconscious components that may contribute to the alienation of diverse students. However instructors, facing populations with radically different mindsets such as California LGBTQIA activist teenagers, Muslim refugees from the Middle-East wars, conservative right-wing fundamentalists, homeless adults with mental challenges, etc., in a country that is increasingly more polarized, must still ensure everyone is taught the way they each need. A responsibility of such magnitude was bound to generate push-back even though Chancellor Ortiz Oakley's measures to accelerate the evolution is itself pressed by the Legislature. For instance, as of January 2018, the Assembly Bill 705 requires colleges to "maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level course work in English and math within a one year time frame" (California Community Colleges. Assessment and Placement. (n.d.)). This is yet another radical departure that requires shortening much needed remedial education by implementing major pedagogical reforms that amount to miracles at times, given the discrepancy between the levels of preparation with which many students arrive on campus, and the academic skills needed to succeed in the CSU and UC colleges

they aspire to eventually join. If educators, however, do not make their classroom "student-ready" for students who are not "college-ready," generations more of students are bound to continue to fail because counselors support, administrators facilitate, chancellors fund, faculty senators advocate, and union leaders protect, but quantifiable progress ultimately results from each instructor's tireless efforts to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of in the classroom.

Chancellor Ortiz Oakley's resolve to "take the bull by the horns" is a necessity and, from his perspective, twenty percent of funding may be a carrot, but the FACCC sees it as a stick. Fundamentally, the pairing of funding with success, namely money with grades, materializes accountability in teaching. The case of the CCCs' vote of no confidence signifies a collective rejection of such dichotomy. While it differentiates teaching from most professions that demand countable deliverables, the Community Colleges' uniquely large-scale capacity to further social justice in the United States is, however, at stake in this dialogue turned dialectic. California Community Colleges (CCC) are a school but also a sanctuary and a lifeline. As Hildreth (2017) explains for instance, DREAMers[8] have been harassed in huge numbers. CCCs welcome and protect students who live in the constant abject fear of "massive deportations" that conjure up images of round-ups and death camps for those of us who grew up long ago, and far away. Very few teachers know how to compensate for the impact on cognition and learning of conditions so unthinkable in the United States. So without the faculty taking on the Chancellor's challenge, the needle may actually move backwards.

Still, regardless of the imbalance of power in Community Colleges, and the contrast between the faculty's privileges and the students' hardships, it may be unrealistic and harsh to demand of these instructors that they be responsible for the success of such a heterogeneous body of students. There is a clear dilemma: on the one hand, students' determining life circumstances are beyond many of the most dedicated teachers' comprehension; on the other hand, making these students bear the full burden of their failure in class equates to re-victimizing the victims. In a country that has long prioritized its elite's prosperity growing ad infinitum over ensuring minimally decent conditions of life for its people, it is up to the entire teaching and learning community to form a body distinct from government and business, but inclusive of the familial and private sphere, that can ensure Community College students not only access education, but also have the capability to learn. The philosopher and law professor Martha Nussbaum, in the wake of Amartya Sen's work on welfare economics, defined the 10 central capabilities in her approach to human rights and development that would inspire the creation of the United Nations' Human Development Index. Her central postulate is particularly relevant to Community Colleges, in California or other states: what good is a right if one is not capable of exercising it? (Nussbaum, 2011) The right to attend Community Colleges is meaningless without the capability of learning and graduating. Given the size and nature of the challenges, this capability can only result from the quasi magic reciprocal interaction between teacher and student, and the most substantial mutual collaboration between instructors, staff, and administrators.

The French review Autrement subtitled its 1981 dossier on *Californie*: *Rêve et cauchemar… Ici s'inventent les vingt prochaines années*. [California: Dream and nightmare… This is where the next twenty years are being invented]. California has always served as an experimental laboratory and model of creative options in

the United States and beyond. The predicament posed to CCCs' teachers, in terms of their accepting, or rejecting, a phenomenal responsibility, presents a circumscribed case study that is emblematic of a fight everyone needs to urgently take on to protect our planet's most vulnerable forms of life, be they human, animal, or environmental. At its core lies knowledge, the powerful weapon the oppressed can acquire to reclaim their integrity, further social justice, and stand against the forces that threaten democracy. Chancellor Ortiz Oakley's strategic plan is too efficiency-bound for the Faculty Association to embrace it given the history, structure, and culture of the system because both sides' leaders are doing their job well. However, the stakes for the state to maintain its economic, intellectual, and socially progressive leadership are as high as those for students to benefit from their only chance to get a higher education. In that context, anything should be open to reexamination first, in the chance reflections usher different practices and rethinking. A Vote of No Confidence limits such possibility, but the case highlights the urgency to renew the dialogue. As the vast majority of capital, economic, and intellectual power is hoarded by a handful of families or corporations, in the United States and the world, the collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, and administrators can constitute the strong civil society needed to counteract social injustice with knowledge and degrees. Without education, there are neither living wages nor equitable engagement in society. Chancellors and instructors need to lead this fight but jointly and give themselves a chance to win it for, and with, our students.

NOTES

1. Community Colleges are one of three types of public higher education institutions in California with more than 2.3 million duplicate students, that is, students who take more than one class. This translates, in terms of Full-Time Equivalent Student unity used to calculate funding to 1,126,709 FTES. There are currently 114 colleges, with a 115th completely online. Apart from 15 colleges granting Bachelor's degrees, all Community Colleges only offer two year Associate's Degrees and Career and Technical Certificates/Degrees. They are primarily responsible for training professionals and public employees: nurses, firemen, mechanics, cooks, emergency medical technicians, airline workers, homeland security, and police officers, hairdressers, florists, zoo keepers, welders, fashion designers, multimedia artists, and even morticians are among the multitude of professional tracks in Community Colleges. They are, therefore, the core engine of the economic growth and workforce development for the States. The California State covers the largest share of education costs, about $8,000 per Community College student in 2014–2015. The student cost per unit, is $46 for residents. Full-time studies with 12 units per term tuitions cost students $864/year. For the vast majority of students who receive low-income fee waivers and grants, education is practically free and funded mostly by the California taxpayers with occasional private organizations supporting specific programs. Next is the California State University that counts 23 campuses. At the top is the most prestigious, the world famous University of California (UC) system which consists of 10 campuses, 5 medical centers, and 3 national laboratories.

2. Vision for Success (n.d.-c) Section lists six goals at https://vision.foundationccc.org/looking-ahead

3. The passage of Assembly Bill 1725 in 1987 was meant to further clarify this distribution of power. Theoretically, it ensures that all constituents, employees as well as students, participate equitably and collegially in the decision-making processes of the college.

4. The 10+1 areas of faculty governance are: Curriculum; degree and certificate requirements; grading policies; educational program development; standards of policies regarding student preparation and success; district and college governance structures as related to

faculty roles; faculty roles and involvement in accreditation progress; professional development policies; program review processes; institutional planning and budget development processes; and #11 other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate.

5. The Century Foundation is a hundred-year-old progressive, nonpartisan think tank that "seeks to foster opportunity, reduce inequality, and promote security at home and abroad." Retrieved from https://tcf.org/

6. Signed in 1988 by Governor Deukmejian, Assembly Bill 1725 emphasizes the new role of California Community Colleges as post-secondary institutions committed to transferring students, offering remedial courses, and providing vocational training. Prior to the bill, community colleges were included in the high school system that they prolonged for two years beyond Grade 12.

7. See the Student Success Initiative 2018 Student Success Scorecards at https://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecardrates.aspx?CollegeID=000

8. California has taken the lead in protecting "DREAMers," the undocumented children of "illegal" immigrants brought at an early age or born in the United States from undocumented parents. As such they qualify for the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act. The vast majority of DREAMers, many of whom carry the trauma of having learned about their illegal status late in their teen-age years, often live in difficult conditions, and try to stay "under the radar." Many California colleges offer "Allies of Dreamers" certificate programs that train those of the administrators, faculty, and staff who wish to best address their very unique needs and suffering.

REFERENCES

Bailey, T., Smith Jaggars, S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boggs, G., & McPhail, J. (2016). *Practical leadership in community colleges: Navigating today's challenges*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

California Community Colleges. Assessment and Placement. (n.d.). What is AB 705? Retrieved from https://assessment.cccco.edu/ab-705-implementation

California Community Colleges Classified Senate (4CS). (1999, October 14). Shared/participatory governance: A position paper. Retrieved from http://www.ccccs.org/publications/4cs_documents/positionpapers/shared_govn.pdf

California Community Colleges: Second Progress Report on the Student Success Act of 2012. (2016, September 22). Legislative analyst's office. Retrieved from https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3500

Chen, G. (2018, April 5). New study: 70% of California Community College students fail. *Community College Review*. Retrieved from https://www.communitycollegereview.com/blog/new-study-70-of-california-community-college-students-fail

Community College Foundation. (n.d.). Accelerating student completion and transfer rates in the California Community Colleges. Retrieved from https://foundationccc.org/What-We-Do/Student-Success

Cuellar Mejia, M., Rodriguez, O., & Johnson, H. (2016, November). Preparing students for success in California's community colleges. *Public Policy Institute of California*. Retrieved from https://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_1116MMR.pdf

Dunn, M., & Walker, J. (2016, September). Union membership in the United States. *US Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2016/union-membership-in-the-united-states/pdf/union-membership-in-the-united-states.pdf

Faculty Association of California Community Colleges. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.faccc.org/about/

Friedman, Z. (2018, June 13). Student loan debt statistics in 2018: A $ 1.5 trillion crisis. *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2018/06/13/student-loan-debt-statistics-2018/#1e686c1a7310

Gavi, P., & Dougier, H. (1981). Californie: Rêve et Cauchemar… Ici s'inventent les vingt prochaines années. *Autrement*, *31*. Paris: Seuil.

Goldrick-Rab, S., Richardson, J., Schneider, J., Hernandez, A., & Cady, C. (2018, April). Still hungry and homeless in college. *Wisconsin HOPE Lab*. Retrieved from https://hope4college.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Wisconsin-HOPE-Lab-Still-Hungry-and-Homeless.pdf

Gordon, L. (2019, May 14). California Community College faculty groups vote no confidence in chancellor. *EdSource*. Retrieved from https://edsource.org/2019/california-community-college-faculty-group-votes-no-confidence-in-chancellor/612474

Hildreth, M. (2017, July 20). Immigration 101: What is a dreamer? *America's Voice*. Retrieved from https://americasvoice.org/blog/what-is-a-dreamer/

Jenkins, R., & Jensen, B. (2010, May-June). How to climb down from top-down leadership. *Academe. American Association of University Professors*. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/article/how-climb-down-top-down-leadership#.XTEFQfJKiM8

Johnson, H., Cook, K., Murphy, P., & Weston, M. (2014, November). Higher education in California: Institutional costs. *Public Policy Institute of California*. Retrieved from https://www.ppic.org/publication/higher-education-in-california-institutional-costs/

Kneedler, R. (2008, October 23). The economic crisis. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2008/10/23/economic-crisis-i

Linderman, D., & Kolenovic, Z. (2013). Moving the completion needle at community colleges: CUNY's accelerated study in associate programs (ASAP), *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *45*(5), 43–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2013.824350

Livingston, T. (1998). *History of California's AB 1725 and its major provisions*. Laguna Niguel, CA: Orange Coast College. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED425764).

Ma, J., & Baum, S. (2016, April). *Trends in community colleges: Enrollment, prices, student debt, and completion*. New York, NY: The College Board.

Nevarez, C., & Wood, L. (2010). *Community college leadership and administration: Theory, practice and change*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ortiz Oakley, E., & Burdman, P. (2015, May 29). Community colleges sending too many into remedial math. *Policy Analysis for California Education*. Retrieved from https://edpolicyinca.org/news/community-colleges-sending-too-many-remedial-math

Reed, M. (2013). *Confessions of a community college administrator*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Robillard, D., Jr. (Ed.). (2000). *Dimensions of managing academic affairs in the community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schuetz, P. (1999, August). Shared governance in community colleges. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED433077.pdf

Shireman, R. (2013, April 14). At California community colleges, 10+1>11. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/

The 2015–2016 Budget: California Community Colleges. (2015, April 8). Legislative analyst office. Retrieved from https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/education/2015/2015-16-budget-CCC-040815.pdf

Todd, J., Holcroft, C., & Evett, C. (2014, October). The challenges of student equity plans. *Academic Senate for California Community Colleges*. Retrieved from https://www.asccc.org/content/challenges-student-equity-plans

"20 Facts". (2011). *Twenty facts about U.S. inequality that everyone should know*. Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality. Retrieved from https://inequality.stanford.edu/publications/20-facts-about-us-inequality-everyone-should-know

Vision for Success. (n.d.-a). Retrieved from https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Vision-for-Success

Vision for Success. (n.d.-b). Executive summary. Retrieved from https://vision.foundationccc.org/executive-summary

Vision for Success. (n.d.-c). Looking ahead. Retrieved from https://vision.foundationccc.org/looking-ahead

Westman, A. (2019, May 30). Commentary: Why faculty voted no confidence in California Community Colleges chancellor. *The San Diego Union Tribune*. Retrieved from https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/opinion/story/2019-05-30/faculty-voted-no-confidence-in-california-community-colleges-chancellor?fbclid=IwAR0cZcQG0B-wxQhd7jVm_F0ceFHfr_bGApA3AruXhqQ95oKFD6xcmkMQopg