

The Significance of the Transfer Mission
for the California Community Colleges

by

STEVEN LYNN CROW

B.A. (Prescott College) 1991
M.Ed. (Northern Arizona University) 1994

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Leadership

in the

OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DAVIS

Approved

Dr. Janet Gong, Chair

Dr. Paul Porter

Dr. Heather Rose

Committee in Charge

2014

© Copyright 2014 by Steven Lynn Crow

All Rights Reserved

Dedication

To my family, Pam, Maile, and Austin. You supported and encouraged me through these years to pursue my dream. And to Mom and Dad, Eddy and Frances Crow; you always encouraged me to keep asking questions.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my wife, Pamela McCormick, who has tirelessly encouraged me to move forward with my dreams and passion for learning. My committee chair, Dr. Janet Gong, has brought me through this journey with unwavering support. Committee member, Dr. Heather Rose, has given me perspective and much needed advice. Committee member, Dr. Paul Porter, has inspired me to assess the educational leader's role and how we can better serve our students. I give many thanks to Dr. Paul Heckman for his support while attending UC Davis. Thank you, Dr. Ken Meier, for the early discussions that led me to my research topic and provided me with a better understanding of the history of the community college in the United States.

Thank you Don Taylor and LeAnn Fong-Batkin, who gave me encouragement and advice when it was needed most and everyone in CANDEL 4. Our cohort was and is very special. A warm thank you to my good friends Sue Meyerot and Mark Gibbons for reading my first drafts and providing thoughtful feedback. I am very grateful to have had Lana Denison proof read many draft versions of my documents, tables, and appendixes. And thanks to Brian Stern for his help with SPSS.

Professor Ben Furlong at Northern Arizona University often started our classes with a question, "What has become clear for you since we last met?" His questions and passion for education inspired me to choose leadership as a career where I can advocate for students.

I sincerely want to thank my current and past college presidents, Dr. Melinda Nish, Randy Lawrence, and Dr. David Pelham, who have supported and encouraged my professional development.

Abstract

This study analyzed the beliefs, attitudes, and practices of California's community college Chief Executive Officers (CEOs or presidents) as they relate to the multiple missions of community colleges and, specifically, the importance, and success of the transfer mission, compared to public data measuring student success, especially transfer rates. Correspondingly, this study attempted to appropriately define and prioritize the fundamental role of the California Community Colleges in increasing the number of students transferring to four-year institutions and to reveal any misalignments in both resources and attitudes relating to the transfer mission.

This study sought to understand what, if any, emphasis is placed on the transfer mission at California community colleges and the ways CEOs balance the multiple missions of community colleges and address the open access policies that guide student admission and matriculation. Do the attitudes of CEOs at each college reflect a commitment to improving transfer rates? What is the primary mission of the CCCs—transfer or a balance among all of the missions? Within the context of many missions, do community college CEOs attempt to balance those missions and the associated resources to accomplish the goals for all students?

State policymakers need to understand how the transfer mission works at the college level to guide their decisions at a state level. By discovering answers to these fundamental questions, this study may help to inform and influence potential changes in state policy.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
<u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	<u>1</u>
THE PROBLEM STATEMENT	1
TABLE 1: SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS, 2008-2009	2
TABLE 2: COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL FUNCTIONS	3
INTRODUCTION	6
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	8
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	8
<u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	<u>11</u>
CONTEXT FOR THE STUDY	11
TABLE 3: BRANCHES OF CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION (EXCERPT FROM 1960 MASTER PLAN).....	11
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	14
FUNDING AND POLICY COMPLEXITIES	15
TABLE 4: THE THREE TESTS UNDER THE PROPOSITION 98 FUNDING GUARANTEES	16
IMPLICATIONS OF POLICIES	18
TABLE 5: CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION SPENDING, 2009-2010	19
<u>CHAPTER THREE</u>	<u>22</u>
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	22
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	24
CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN AND THE TRANSFER MISSION	27
PUBLIC POLICY AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION	28
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS (CEOs)	32
ASSUMPTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	35
<u>CHAPTER FOUR</u>	<u>36</u>
METHODOLOGY	36
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	36
SITE AND STUDY OVERVIEW	36
INSTRUMENTATION	37
INTERNAL RELIABILITY	39
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	40
SURVEY POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZE	41
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	42
LIMITATIONS AND BIAS	42
<u>CHAPTER FIVE</u>	<u>45</u>
RESULTS	45
COLLEGE DEMOGRAPHICS	45
TABLE 6: SINGLE-COLLEGE DISTRICT OR MULTI-COLLEGE DISTRICT	46

TABLE 7.1: SIZE OF PARTICIPANTS' COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	47
TABLE 7.2: SIZE OF PARTICIPANTS' COLLEGES	47
CEO LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE	48
TABLE 8: TIME SERVED BY PARTICIPANTS AS A CEO/PRESIDENT.....	48
TABLE 9: TIME SERVED BY PARTICIPANTS AS CEO/PRESIDENT AT THEIR CURRENT COLLEGES	49
MISSIONS AND PRIORITIES	49
TABLE 10: NUMBER OF YEARS ELAPSED SINCE REVIEW OF THE MISSION STATEMENT	50
TABLE 11: YEARS SINCE CHANGE IN THE MISSION STATEMENT.....	51
TABLE 12: INVOLVEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT OF MISSION STATEMENT.....	51
TABLE 13: COLLEGE MISSION PRIORITY	53
TABLE 14: CEO MISSION PRIORITY	54
TABLE 15: CEO MISSION INVOLVEMENT	55
TABLE 16: STUDENT DEMAND FOR TRANSFER AT YOUR COLLEGE CONSISTENCY WITH STUDY	56
TABLE 17: STUDENT TRANSFER COMPLETION CONSISTENCY WITH STUDY.....	57
LEADERSHIP ACTIONS – SUPPORT FOR THE MISSION	58
TABLE 18: STATE SUPPORT FOR MISSION.....	59
TABLE 19: EMPHASIS ON TRANSFER IN CONTEXT OF CEO'S COMMUNICATION OF THE MISSION	60
TABLE 20: ALLOCATIONS OF RESOURCES REFLECT MISSION PRIORITIES.....	61
TABLE 21: CHANGE OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES NEEDED TO ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO TRANSFER	62
TABLE 22: POLICIES TO LIMIT ACCESS TO FAVOR TRANSFER MISSION.....	64
TABLE 23: CURRENT LEVEL OF ACCESS, ADDRESSING THE MOST IMPORTANT MISSION OBJECTIVES	66
TABLE 24. TRANSFER RATES NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	67
CROSS-TABULATIONS	67
TABLE 25: QUESTION 8 AND QUESTION 9 CROSS-TABULATION	70
TABLE 26: QUESTION 8 AND QUESTION 10 CROSS-TABULATION	70
TABLE 27: QUESTION 9 AND QUESTION 10 CROSS-TABULATION	71
TABLE 28 QUESTION 10 AND QUESTION 14 CROSS-TABULATION	71
TABLE 29: QUESTION 8 AND QUESTION 13 CROSS-TABULATION	72
TABLE 30: QUESTION 3, QUESTION 8, QUESTION 9 CROSS-TABULATION CEO EXPERIENCE	73
INITIAL FINDINGS	74
<u>CHAPTER SIX.....</u>	<u>76</u>
FINDINGS	76
RESEARCH QUESTION ONE.....	76
RESEARCH QUESTION TWO	78
CEO EMPHASIS ON THE TRANSFER MISSION	78
CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN AND THE TRANSFER MISSION	80
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC DATA	82
RESOURCES AND POLICY CONTEXT	83
CEO LEADERSHIP AND EXPERIENCE	84
CONCLUSIONS	85
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	87
RESEARCH NEEDED.....	91
FINAL THOUGHTS	92
<u>REFERENCES.....</u>	<u>94</u>
<u>APPENDIX A: SURVEY.....</u>	<u>102</u>

EMAIL COVER LETTER:..... 108
EMAIL FOLLOW UP LETTER 109
APPENDIX B: VARIABLES..... 110
APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS 113
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS (FTES) 113
TRANSFER VELOCITY..... 113
APPENDIX D: DISTRICTS- FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT STUDENTS..... 114
APPENDIX E: FUNDING APPORTIONMENTS FOR DISTRICTS..... 117
APPENDIX F: NARRATIVE RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION 18..... 120

CHAPTER ONE

The Problem Statement

The community college system is a significant component of higher education in California, playing a vital role in providing access to affordable education for the people of the Golden State. This role is prescribed in California's 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan), which identifies transfer to a four-year university and access to higher education as primary components of the community college mission (University of California Office of the President, 2009). Accordingly, community colleges are intended to provide a pathway through which students can pursue the first two years of their baccalaureate and, thereafter, readily transfer to a campus of the University of California (UC) or the California State University (CSU) to complete an undergraduate degree. And while the Master Plan delineates multiple missions and objectives for community colleges, the transfer mission is seen as integral to the goal of creating a well-educated, engaged citizenry, capable of leading the social, civic, and economic vitality of the state.

Today, nearly 2.75 million students (calculated as total "headcount") attend the California community colleges (CCC) (Scott, 2010). Yet, the number of students who actually attend community colleges and seek a degree, a certificate of completion, or transfer requirements for a UC or CSU campus is alarmingly low (CPEC, 2007). As Table 1 illustrates, of the approximately 1.8 million students (calculated as total "full-time equivalent students" or "FTES") attending community colleges in California in 2008-2009, only 5.5% transferred to a four-year institution (Community College League of California, 2010b). This is particularly disconcerting given the projection that

California faces a looming statewide education and economic crisis—a shortfall of an estimated one million college graduates, working-age adults necessary for a healthy state economy by the year 2025 (Johnson and Sengupta, 2009). These trends lead to a compelling question, “Are community colleges in California meeting the transfer imperative specified in the Master Plan?” If not, as appears to be the case, what factors contribute to this deficiency? What changes or alignments in mission, policy, or leadership practices might produce more promising results?

Table 1: Successful Outcomes of Community College Students, 2008-2009

<i>Transfers to</i>	
UC:	14,056
CSU:	49,770
In State Private:	19,827
Out of State:	15,927
<hr/>	
Total Transfers	99,580
Number of FTE in CCC system	1,800,000
Percentage of transfer students	(5.5% of full-time equivalent)

Source: Community College League of California, 2010b

Two principal issues compound how these questions might be readily understood and answered. Ironically, both are as much strengths of the community college system as they are weaknesses and include (1) the multiple missions of community colleges and (2) the open access policies that guide student admission and matriculation. A brief discussion of each follows.

As prescribed in the Master Plan, the transfer mission is one of many missions established for California’s community colleges. The instructional functions of community colleges are enumerated in Table 2.

Table 2: Community College Instructional Functions

Instructional Functions Specifically Assigned to Community Colleges (Junior Colleges)

1. The first two years of a collegiate education for students planning to complete work for baccalaureate degrees
2. Two-year associate in arts degree programs with broad application for citizenship, health, family living, science, and basic communication needed by citizens
3. Vocational-technical, general education and training to prepare students for occupations which require two years of training or less
4. Counseling services sufficiently extensive to meet the needs of [students].
5. Remedial courses for students whose preparation for their chosen curricula is inadequate
6. Vocational-technical, general education, and other appropriate programs for part-time students

Source: *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960 -1975*
(University of California Office of the President, 2009, p. 208-209)

In addition to the missions outlined in the Master Plan, most California community colleges also have legal, financial, or policy-related requirements that are tied to the expectations of local constituencies or the ever-changing priorities and regulatory guidelines of the state. To further complicate the landscape, the evolving needs and vast diversity of students influence the multiple missions of each institution. In short, the broad missions of these colleges reflect attempts to satisfy a range of student needs, while balancing state and local priorities.

Since the writing of the Master Plan, the “junior colleges” of California have evolved to include local community mission components. Similar evolutions of

community college missions have occurred throughout the United States; mirroring the evolving needs of the communities they serve (Meier, 2008, p. 344). Across the country, the emphasis for these colleges to be a student's first two-year experience of a four-year education has changed dramatically. In addition, since the 1970s many other mission priorities have emerged that impact curriculum and compete for resources, primarily in vocational programs (Dougherty, 1994, p. 35). Grubb has gone so far as to comment that "the multiple missions of the community colleges are a source of conflict and complexity imposed upon them." (Grubb, 1999, p. 350-352). As a result, chief executive officers (CEOs) at each college struggle to balance the pressures related to these competing interests. This is no small leadership challenge, especially in a time of increasing demands, conflicting priorities, and diminishing resources.

The Master Plan also prescribed affordable access for anyone graduating from a California high school or otherwise able to benefit from instruction (University of California Office of the President (UCOP), 2009, p. 209). It designated community colleges, or junior colleges, as they were first known, to be an access safety net for anyone seeking a higher education. (Douglas, 2000, p. 125). It was acknowledged that access to higher education might require a different pathway through the system, depending upon the preparedness or financial ability of each student. But regardless of route, the community colleges would ensure access to a four-year degree through the transfer process, after requirements had been met, even if a student was not initially prepared or financially capable of attending a CSU or UC institution. (Master Plan, University of California Office of the President, 2009, p. 73).

While the concept of open access is a most desirable and necessary social commitment, it does compound the curricular, resource, and leadership priorities of community colleges. An open door policy, established by the Master Plan, requires that everyone be admitted, regardless of the intent of the student. For some students, that intention might be an exploration of higher education, a sharpening of basic skills, or an entrée to a vocation, rather than an unobstructed sprint to a four-year institution. Community college leaders cannot establish policies that admit only those students seeking transfer, nor can they somehow restrict access through admission requirements similar to California's UC and CSU systems. Measuring the effectiveness of CCCs in fulfilling their transfer mission is a complex undertaking as students may be pursuing outcomes other than terminal degrees or transfer.

The many missions of community colleges, the complexities of open-access policies, and the potential lack of emphasis on the transfer mission at each college further complicates what, at first, seems to be a dismal measure of student matriculation success.

With these issues in mind, and with the backdrop of economic urgency, this study sought to understand the significance of the transfer mission at each community college and to identify the emphasis that leaders place on that mission at their own colleges.

What do the CEOs at these colleges perceive their primary mission to be? In this study, *The Significance of the Transfer Mission at California Community Colleges*, I have done the following:

- Focus on the emphasis placed on the transfer mission at community colleges in California;

- Measure and describe that emphasis in terms of the senior leadership attitudes comparing those attitudes to the mission and actual student success in terms of transfer readiness;
- Identify misalignment found between leadership attitudes and the actual practice at the colleges; and
- Raise the question: Should the community college mission focus more on transferring students and less on activities that do not lead to a degree or certification?

Introduction

Serving 2.75 million students, the California Community College System (CCCs) is the largest system of higher education in America (Scott, 2010). As such, the system has an enormous capacity to provide California with a pipeline of college graduates; a capacity that is essential, given California's economic need for 1 million more students equipped with a baccalaureate degree by 2020, (PPIC, 2009, p. 1). Indeed California will see a serious shortfall in its supply of workers with a college education if current trends do not change. However, despite the state's workforce needs and the CCC system's capacity to meet these needs, the all-essential transfer path for those students who seek to attain their baccalaureate degree at a four-year college or university is a complex one, made even more difficult by the changing educational and policy-based priorities of the state and its educational institutions.

The Master Plan, codified in the Donahoe Higher Education Act (University of California Office of the President, 2009), defined the transfer mission as a primary role for the CCCs among many other roles left to each college for implementation. While it is

unclear what the right mix of missions is statewide, state leaders are clear that significant improvement is needed along with additional resources to achieve greater student success. Jack Scott, Chancellor of the CCCs, addressing an audience of CEOs and community college trustees, proclaimed that this primary mission needs greater emphasis by leaders and allocation of more resources to transfer more students statewide. Scott further illustrated the importance of prioritizing the transfer mission, as well as vocational programs and basic skills, but acknowledged that physical education programs and community education should receive either less priority or less state funding (Scott, 2010).

What do CEOs at the CCCs think about the emphasis on the transfer mission? Do they see the emphasis as being too little, a problem, or is a very small demand for transfer already being met? Do they prioritize their resources and provide sufficient courses to meet the transfer demand? Or, are most classrooms filled with vocational instruction, basic skills, or community education courses? California's economic and political future depends on the improvement of participation rates and successful completion of postsecondary student goals (CCLC, 2010b, p. 8). Do the CEOs at the CCCs perceive a greater demand for the transfer mission than is being met? This study addressed the current emphasis placed on the transfer mission at the CCCs and the need for change perceived by the CEOs at each college. The findings from this study are important to gain a better understanding of the challenges to achievement of student success as defined the Master Plan and to inform local leaders and state policy makers about issues facing each college and the state system of community colleges.

Research Questions

Given these questions and concerns, the primary research questions for this study are the following:

1. What is the degree of emphasis on the transfer mission at California community colleges?
2. To what degree do the attitudes of CEOs at each college reflect a commitment to improving transfer rates?

Related to these primary research questions are some additional queries:

3. What are the emphases of the CEOs at CCCs regarding the relative importance of the transfer mission in comparison to other CCC missions?
4. What is the current commitment to the transfer mission at CCCs?
5. What is the primary mission of the CCCs—transfer or a balance among all of the missions?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because of the lack of other studies in the literature that examine community college CEOs' beliefs and attitudes toward the transfer mission. Within the context of many missions, community college CEOs attempt to balance institutional missions and the associated resources to accomplish these goals for all students. State policymakers need to understand how the transfer mission works at the college level to guide their decisions at a state level.

Current studies on the transfer mission tend to focus on two principal concerns: (1) accountability in terms of community college students attaining baccalaureate degrees compared to students entering a four-year institution their freshman year and (2) the

failure of colleges to determine the appropriate priorities for student success. In their efforts to serve all enrolling students, colleges may lower educational expectations for the student attempting the first two of four years at a community college. The multiple missions of a community college may offer a student an easier, shorter path to some other goal or frustrate the student because of a lack of focus on the transfer mission. For example, Alfonso (2006) concludes that, even when controlling for student expectations, those students who attend community college and declare an intention to transfer have less chance of achieving a baccalaureate degree than students entering a four-year institution as a freshman. Conclusions further suggest community colleges are an open door to higher education but do not provide a “straightforward path” to a four-year degree (Alfonso, 2006, p. 897). Another study published by the Public Policy Institute of California determined that, of the students at California Community Colleges who focused on transferable courses, only one quarter eventually did transfer to a four-year institution (Sengupta & Jepsen, 2006, p. 2).

Public policy often ties state funding to different measures of student success. The Legislature signed Senate Bill 1440 into law in 2010 to improve community college transfer rates to the California State University (CSU) system. Senate Bill 1440, “The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act,” requires CSU to accept transfer degrees from all community colleges. Community colleges, in turn, are required to create standard associate of arts degrees that are transferable or face funding penalties through the loss of apportionment (CCCCO, 2011). Each college, under the leadership of its CEO, is charged with developing and maintaining the local success of its mission that is often modified through a state mandate.

With such a mandate, clearly, it is important to determine if a straightforward path is even the goal of the CCCs, given their multiple missions and open access complexities. Understanding the leadership commitment, emphasis, and prioritized resources becomes even more important as CCCs focus on successful student transfer. At the core of such an understanding is the question of the CCC mission. Public policy experts, such as the Institute for Higher Education and Policy, conclude that California's future rests with its higher education system and that community colleges are the "linchpin" of the system. They further recommend that new policies are needed to guide the appropriate allocation of resources to achieve intended results (Shulock & Moore, 2007, p. 15).

There is little or no research that measures the emphasis placed on the transfer mission at California's Community Colleges (CCCs). The goal of this study was to collect and analyze the beliefs, attitudes, and practices of the CEOs as they relate to the transfer mission at each college. Correspondingly, this study attempted to appropriately define and prioritize the fundamental role of the CCCs in increasing the number of students transferring to four-year institutions and reveal any misalignments in both resources and attitudes relating to the transfer mission. By discovering answers to these fundamental questions, this study may help to inform and influence potential changes in state policy.

CHAPTER TWO

Context for the Study

The Chief Executive Officer’s role in facilitating the transfer mission at California community colleges needs to be examined within the context of multiple missions, public policy, and the allocation of resources.

The Master Plan is important for setting the priorities of community college presidents. Under the Master Plan, community colleges or the once named junior colleges officially became one of three segments of higher education, which include UC, CSU, and the CCCs. Specific roles, responsibilities, and relationships of each were defined in the Master Plan. Table 3 provides a brief overview of these functions.

Table 3: Branches of California Higher Education (excerpt from 1960 Master Plan)

System	Overview of Functions
Community Colleges	...Junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the 13th and 14th grade level, including but not limited to one or more of the following: (a) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (b) vocational-technical fields leading to employment, and (c) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in each field may lead to the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science degree . . .
CSU	The state colleges shall have as their primary function the provision of instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in professions and applied fields which require more than two years of collegiate education, and teacher education, both for undergraduate students and graduate students through the master’s degree. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as hereinafter provided. Faculty research, using facilities provided for and consistent with the primary function of the state colleges, is authorized. . . .
UC	The University shall provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over training for the professions (including but not by way of limitation) 7 dentistry, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and graduate architecture. The University shall have the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctor’s degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the state colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. The University shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research, and The Regents shall make reasonable provision for the use of its library and research facilities by qualified members of the faculties of other higher educational institutions, public and private.

Source: *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960 -1975*, p. 36-37)

The missions of the UC, CSU, and community colleges were defined to include multiple pathways for all students seeking a baccalaureate degree, allowing students to enroll first at a community college, CSU, or UC, depending upon their academic readiness or ability to pay (University of California Office of the President, 2009, p. 208).

Under the Master Plan, the community colleges are required to serve many missions. In sharp contrast to California's university systems, the University of California and the California State University, the community colleges have local governance control and less control over revenue sources. CEOs attempt to maintain these multiple missions with a relatively lower funding allocation per student (Murphy, 2004 p. 17). While there are different needs being addressed at each branch of higher education in California and therefore arguably different levels of funding per student needed, the CEO at each community college must adhere to state policy while also balancing community needs by means of a localized governance structure and influence.

Community colleges in California have evolved over time into multi-mission institutions. The first "junior colleges" were named such for their role to provide a gateway to four-year institutions. "Starting as extensions of local school districts, many of the first junior colleges emerged as advanced grades of high school" (Bragg, 2001, p. 97 – 98). This evolution has had an impact on the mission, broadening it to encompass local community needs and growing state directives.

The CCCs are comprised of 72 districts with 112 colleges, each with a mission statement that attempts to address the junior college functions defined in the Master Plan. Districts can consist of a single institution or multiple colleges for a geographic area governed by elected local boards with members at-large or representing regions within a

district. The California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) located in Sacramento is charged with providing leadership, advocacy, and support of the California Community Colleges. As the administrative branch of the California Community Colleges system, the Chancellor's Office is also responsible for allocating state funding to the colleges and districts following California Education Code and regulatory guidelines. The Chancellor's Office is comprised of the offices of the chancellor and vice chancellors who oversee the work of ten major divisions. These divisions are responsible for Academic Affairs, College Finance and Facilities Planning; Economic Development and Workforce Planning; Governmental Relations; Human Resources; Internal Operations; Legal Affairs; Strategic Planning and Communications; Student Services and Special Programs; and Technology, Research, and Information Systems. Both the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors were created by legislation passed in 1967 (CCCCO, 2011b).

The Master Plan, while revisited over the years, has remained quite similar in its principal tenets and assignment of responsibility to educational sectors since its beginnings in 1960, and the plan continues to serve as the roadmap for educational leaders today. This being said, in community colleges, the CEO is hired by a local governing board and is the primary educational administrator responsible for facilitating and setting priorities at his or her institution (Moriarty, 1994, p. 70-71). The community college CEO faces a morass of strategic planning priorities and competing needs in order to attain the educational goals of his or her community college; a competition that reflects a balance of both local and state priorities. Adding further complexity, these competing missions form the basis for multiple measures of accountability influencing the CEO's

decision to allocate resources. To mitigate these philosophic, planning, and budgetary complications and create a clearer strategic direction for community colleges, it is generally acknowledged that major policy changes (which might better align the higher education systems) are needed at the state level (Shulock, p. 95). Indeed many community college CEOs have questioned a model of education that relies on supply and demand for services at the community college and the threat it presents to the democratic principal of access to higher education (Grubb, p. 55 – 57).

Vocational Education

In addition to the mission of transfer, community colleges are both traditionally and currently responsible for vocational education. CEOs are often faced with maintaining a tension between the roles of transfer and vocational missions as they provide vocational training for the community and state. How do community colleges serve students equally well who are striving for very different outcomes? Many students who enter community college seeking transfer to university may be diverted to the vocational programs that may not lead to transfer status or a degree (Dougherty, 1994, p. 20). In an attempt to embrace a broad mission statement that is charged with “democratizing access to higher education,” critics often portray that statement as hampering attainment of the baccalaureate (Dougherty, 1994, p. 21). This dynamic shapes the role of the CEO and the ways the college balances these seemingly contradictory missions.

Funding and Policy Complexities

To situate this study in a contemporary context, it was important to examine the most significant current policy and funding issues specific to California. Trying to achieve the college's mission within the current state funding constraints creates multiple challenges for the CEO. For the purpose of this study, the CEO was viewed as an educational administrator guided by the Master Plan, who is charged with achieving the college's mission, as reflected in a locally governed district. She or he is expected to achieve this outcome, despite restrictive funding regulations and apportionment from the state. The CEO may use existing revenues and expenses to address the mission of a college in the most efficient manner but must seek additional revenue sources to accomplish underfunded portions of the mission.

With these objectives in mind, two major propositions have created the greatest tension for CEOs navigating community college funding challenges in California. Proposition 13, approved by the voters in 1978, all but eliminated the ability of community colleges to raise revenue through local taxation. (Murphy, 2004, p. 58). Exceptions to this are the ability of a community college district to pass local bond measures or parcel taxes, though bond measures are most often used for one-time costs, particularly related to new building construction, and parcel taxes are often defined for new, specific revenue streams (Murphy, 2004, pp. 59-60). Both approaches require electorate approval, and in challenging economic times, passage of such taxes is both challenging and uncertain.

Proposition 98, which was passed in 1988, guarantees minimum funding for California K-12 schools and community colleges, based upon revenues received at the

state level (Murphy, 2004, pp. 19-20). It provides a constitutionally protected portion of the state budget in the form of these guarantees and allows for increases in funding with increased state revenues.

Proposition 98 includes a series of tests (see Table 4) that can guarantee minimum state funding to community colleges.

Table 4: The Three Tests under the Proposition 98 Funding Guarantees

Proposition 98 is generally calculated based on three "tests" (i.e., Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3). The following is a brief description of these tests:

- Test 1 – Percent of General Fund (GF) revenues: Requires that K-12 schools and community colleges receive at least the same share of state GF tax revenues as in 1986-87 (at least 34.56 percent of the state budget).
- Test 2 – Adjustments based on statewide income: Requires that K-12 schools and community colleges receive at least the same amount of combined state funds and local tax dollars as was received in the prior year, adjusted for statewide growth in average daily attendance and inflation (i.e., annual change in per capita personal income).
- Test 3 – Adjustment based on available resources: This "test" is calculated the same as "Test 2," except that the inflation factor is equal to the annual change in per capita state GF revenues plus 0.5 percent. Test 3 is used only when it calculates a guarantee that is less than that determined by "Test 2."

As passed in 1998, Proposition 98 contains a provision for "suspension." Under this provision, the state is allowed to suspend the minimum funding level for one year through urgency legislation.

Sources: Murphy, 2004, p. 20, and California State Assembly, March, 2003, p. 2

However, Proposition 98 also contains language that allows it to be suspended during difficult budgetary periods, thus creating additional uncertainty for CEOs when projecting multi-year budgets (Murphy, 2004, p. 21). As Timar indicates,

“Perhaps Prop 98's greatest impact... has been to use the state budget as a policy tool... Policymakers do not know how much money will be

available for the following year's budget until the so-called May revise."(Timar, p. 184, 2003).

To add to these two foundational propositions, Senate Bill 361, passed in 2006, attempted to "equalize" the distribution of funding for all California community college districts, with provisions to provide base funding for overhead services (California Community Colleges System Office, 2006). Taken together, these public and legislative measures both define and constrain the budgetary and policy landscape for community colleges. The funding levels for community colleges are primarily determined at the state level and vary in relation to availability within any given year. Funding for specific activities can shift year to year in the form of restricted or categorical funds (Murphy, 2004, p.55).

CEOs are primarily guided by the Master Plan, which broadly defines the roles of the CSUs, UCs, and the CCCs. The CEO at each community college must interpret the focus of the school's mission. While the funding formulas of the aforementioned propositions and legislation were meant to set minimum revenue guarantees and provide the ability to keep pace with student demand, they have failed to do so. Instead, funding uncertainties, even at the mid-fiscal year, have added to the chaotic nature of budgeting at individual districts and have impeded the ability of the CCCs to create responsible, multi-year budget models.

California's community colleges and K-12 schools are primarily funded by a combination of State apportionment, local property taxes, and student fees (Murphy, p. 38). Proposition 98 requires that community colleges share the funding formula with K-12 schools, but this formula has resulted in a funding loss for community colleges for each of the ten years since the rules were put in place (Murphy, 2004, p. 19). California

Community Colleges have experienced large cuts over multiple years because of their primary dependency upon the economy.

Current funding levels have led districts to choose between reducing their offerings and spreading their already modest resources even farther. The former option means the CCC system will fall short of its commitment to “provide an appropriate place in California public higher education for every student who is willing and able to benefit from attendance,” as stipulated in section 66201 of the state’s Education Code, while the latter option threatens the “quality of the services” provided (Murphy, 2004, xi).

Implications of Policies

Proposition 98 creates a formula for sharing statewide tax revenues with the K-12 school system (see Table 5). This formula-driven policy provides about two-thirds of community college funding (Hill, 2005, p. 3). However, with the property tax limits established in 1978 under Proposition 13, local funds for K-12s are reduced, which further limits the yearly-required percentage for CCCs. CCCs funding is cut even more under allowances for suspension of Proposition 98 (Spencer, 2002). Because of this underfunding, community colleges are increasingly forced to reduce course options for students through course section elimination.

The reduction of course options often result in turning students away, in direct conflict with an open door policy and adherence to the California Master Plan for Education, which states CCCs must “admit any student capable of benefiting from instruction” (California Legislature Joint Committee, 1999-2004). The Governor’s budget for 2008 -2009, representing an increase of 2.4 percent over 2007-2008, barely met the required Proposition 98 funding levels for K-12, and the CCCs have not been able to

address automatic cost increases to the system, including basic operational costs. After the passage of this budget, Governor Schwarzenegger announced, “This budget is nothing to be proud of.” Shortly after, he called the legislature into emergency session to consider further cuts to the budget to address imminent shortfalls in anticipated revenues. Dubbed a failure by many, Proposition 98 has consistently provided less than the promised funding for the community college system and has often placed the K-12 system in a direct, combative position, resulting in billions of dollars lost or deferred to the CCCs (Spence, 2002, pp. 4-5). Regardless of who wins the debate over the value Proposition 98 creates for the CCCs, the policy creates budget uncertainty every year for CEOs.

Table 5: California Higher Education Spending, 2009-2010

Higher Education Segment	2009 – 2010 Actual ¹ Programmatic Spending Per Full Time Student
University of California	\$17,484
California State University	10,143
California Community Colleges	5,551 ²

Source: LAO, January 2011

Includes General Fund, tuition and fees, local property tax revenues, federal stimulus funds, and Lottery proceeds.

Counts deferral monies in the fiscal year in which they were programmed (as opposed to when received) by districts. Reflects funding per budgeted full-time equivalent student

The decisions leaders face at each college are made even more difficult during times of shrinking budgets and constrained resources. Indeed, prior to and during the

timeframe that this study was conducted (2011-13), colleges were experiencing severe budget cuts due to statewide revenue shortfalls. Even with the passage of Proposition 30 in 2012, which provided some budgetary relief in this situation (i.e., Proposition 30 authorized temporary tax revenues to stabilize the per-student funding formula for community colleges), California Community Colleges experienced a reduction in budgetary resources of \$809 million or 12% since the 2008/09 fiscal year (CCCCO, 2013).

Besides state policies that are relevant to resource allocation, additional state legislation specifically pertains to the missions of the community colleges. Recent public policy requires compliance to transfer degree standards. For example, Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla), the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (STAR), requires community college districts to grant transferable associate degrees to students in their field of study. Upon completion of the transfer associate degree, the student may transfer into the CSU system with junior standing. This new law aligns community colleges and the CSU system but prohibits any state funding to accomplish it (CCCCO, 2011). Additional resources in the form of people's time to comply with new law will create an even greater strain on the scarce resources available to CEOs.

Given the history of community colleges in California, the social obligations assumed and primary mission statement prescribed in the Master Plan, and the growing need for graduates in California, it would seem incumbent upon CEOs to focus more on the transfer mission at their colleges, if they are not already doing so. This study surveyed CEOs about their attitudes toward the transfer mission at their colleges, including their

perceptions of the resources needed to address the current low transfer success rates of students.

CHAPTER THREE

Review of the Literature

This literature review examines the significance of the transfer mission as a priority for community college presidents (Chief Executive Officers or CEOs) and focuses on the interplay between the evolving mission of California community colleges and public policies concerned with the associated resource allocation to the state's system of community colleges.

Brint and Karabel frame the community college purpose as a “promise of educational opportunity” (Brint and Karabel, 1989) but observe that, through the increased access of lower-scoring students, those students may be diverted from the dream of a four-year education. This increased access brought on a surge in vocational programs that lacked the curriculum for transfer eligibility (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p.99).

The **functionalist** advocates see a broader mission statement as “democratizing access to higher education” (Dougherty, 1994, p. 21). This democratizing access theory speaks to the evolution of the multiple missions of the CCCs, particularly the missions of basic skills, vocational education, associate's degrees, and the transfer mission. All taken together, these missions truly do create a range of access options that help students use education to further their individual circumstance, value education, and have a fuller foundation for engaged citizenship in a democratic society. While this construct frames the development of multiple missions and gives importance to multiple missions, it also is at the heart of how having so many missions that are equally prioritized may hinder the success of each mission, particularly within a time of limited resources. It is this

construct and the conflict that it causes that frames this study and its research questions asking CEOs about how they balance and prioritize the transfer mission within the larger context of multiple missions.

This chapter first examines the founding principles that led to the establishment of the junior colleges as a branch of higher education in California and discusses how those colleges evolved their mission and changed their name to community colleges.” The literature examined here suggests a series of assumptions detailing the importance of community colleges to provide an open pathway to higher education while retaining multiple missions that address training a work force and preparing good citizens. The literature review indicates an assumption that the transfer mission is valued at the CCCs and that it is the CEOs’ duty to manage an environment in which students can succeed, whatever the definition of success is, within their first two years of higher education.

Second, in this review, I examine the Master Plan regarding the role of the community college and its focus on the transfer mission as related to other segments of higher education in California. The Master Plan originally prescribed a higher education system in California that would maximize access while preserving selectivity in the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems. Today, community colleges are often seen as attempting to be all things to everybody. The multiple missions of the community colleges may threaten the viability of effectively addressing the first two years of a four-year degree, the transfer mission. Frequently, current studies measure the ability of community colleges to transfer students as a measure of effectiveness.

Third, I review literature that analyzes public policy and resource allocation to accomplish the community college missions. And finally, I present background information on college presidents (the Chief Executive Officers or CEOs), and discuss their primary leadership role in shaping and prioritizing the mission of community colleges. I also review how these leaders perceive or address any misalignment in priorities when balancing the needs of their local communities with the needs or mandates of the state.

Community Colleges

Recognized as an American innovation, the invention of the community college was met with doubts that such a hybrid of missions could survive (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p. v). The first junior college opened in 1901 in Joliet, Illinois, followed by a rapid rise in junior college enrollment nationwide from just over 8,000 students in 1919 to almost 150,000 students in 1939 (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p. 23).

Junior colleges faced early opposition in some states by supporters of private institution who saw them as public-funded competition (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p. 143). The addition of the junior college in California provided educational opportunities in a new age of economic and population growth in the state. The junior college appeared to be two institutions wrapped into one, which created stepping-stones to the university and also was capable of training a much-needed workforce in a rapidly expanding society (Douglass, 2000, p. 124).

Since the 1970s most community colleges have promoted a “comprehensive” curriculum that attempts to mirror the first two years at a four-year institution and that addresses the local and state workforce needs. This expanding demand for services to

meet the goals prioritized by the local community and the state may also influence the associated funding incentives that increase discretionary spending opportunities for the colleges. Administrators are often faced with prioritizing these opportunities in light of scarce funding to achieve a more focused mission for their colleges (Bailey, 2003, p. 4).

The CEO at each community college may not be the primary determining force of a college's mission. A strong argument can be made that a college's mission is heavily influenced by the established culture of the institution. Local partnerships and traditions of a college may outlive the influence of a single CEO who may only lead the college for a few years (Shaw and London, pp. 91–114, 2001).

All community colleges in California are required to abide by regulations set forth within AB 1725, passed in 1988, wherein major changes were made to the education code with regard to the mission focus of the community college system in California.

...Existing law provides that the course of study for the California Community Colleges includes, as primary objectives, instruction designed to prepare students for admission to the upper division of 4-year educational institutions, and in vocational and technical fields leading to employment, general or liberal arts courses, and community services.

This bill would revise the missions and goals of the community Colleges. The bill would also direct the board of governors, the Regents of the University of California (at their option), and the Trustees of the California State University to jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate as specified, a common core curriculum in general education courses and lower division major preparation curricula for purposes of transfer. This bill would impose a state-mandated local program by requiring that the community colleges award an associate degree to each student who successfully meets certain requirements, including the transfer core curriculum as described. (AB 1725, p2, 1988).

AB 1725 was an attempt to impose goals and specific activities at each California community college spanning core curriculum requirements, funding formulas, full time faculty hiring quotas, and how each college would be governed. While the specific

challenges raised under AB 1725 are beyond the scope of this study, CEOs must consider its impact upon their day-to-day decisions. A notable outcome of AB 1725 that continues to be the center of debate and interpretation is the definition and implantation of a participatory governance structure that gives each college's academic senate certain curriculum powers and provides for input from all college constituent groups (Education Code 70901, 70902).

The California Community College system is designed to be an important component of higher education, in partnership with the UC and CSU systems (Douglass, p. 124 - 131). Unlike the UCs and CSUs throughout California, community colleges have locally elected governing boards that address both community needs and a state focus driven by funding through state apportionment (Murphy, 2004, p. 4). The state's 112 community colleges are growing within 72 districts and serve almost three million students, making the CCCs the largest system of higher education in the world (CCCCO, 2010a). The California Master Plan, first introduced in 1960, broadly outlines the purpose of the community college as serving any student who can benefit from instruction. That loosely charged mission has been interpreted to address goals beyond the resources available to each college. Locally elected governing boards for each district are tasked with overseeing the financial stability of each district amid the uncertainty of funding for specific programs and overall funding for basic operational needs.

California community colleges have adopted mission statements that often reflect or directly lift the phrase "admit any student capable of benefiting from instruction," as prescribed by the Master Plan. But the word *benefit* has become the focus of debate at each college as local boards direct their CEOs, superintendents, or presidents to prioritize

course offerings and budget resources. These local actions reflect the directive from CCC Chancellor Jack Scott when he says, “each college must determine what must be kept and what can be removed” (Scott, 2009b). These local decisions will determine to what degree each community’s needs are met beyond the higher education needs of the state.

California Master Plan and the Transfer Mission

The original intent of the Master Plan was to guide California in managing intense demand for higher education, primarily from the baby boomer generation (Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2009c, p. 3). In addition, the Master Plan provided growth management of higher education institutions and addressed the issues of costs by diverting a large number of students into the community college system. When the Legislature approved the Master Plan, it provided clear policy direction in many areas to the three public higher education segments, University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges. The Master Plan provided for the differentiation of functions of each segment, as well as the establishment of the principle of universal access and choice, as well as the differentiation of admissions pools for the segments. In addition, it confirmed California’s commitment to keep tuition low and provide financial aid and also specified a governance structure for the segments. Although these policies provided clear policy direction to the segments at the time it was written, much has changed in the last 50 years.

Since 1960, enrollments in California public higher education have increased tenfold, from 179,000 to nearly 2 million full-time equivalent enrollments, while the state’s population has not even tripled, rising from 15.3 million to 37.4 million (UCOP,

2009). The demand for resources from California's limited state budget that funds the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges has never been greater. In addition, each public higher education segment has grown tremendously. In particular, the university systems and the community colleges have grown rapidly since 1960, both in enrollment and physical capacity, in response to a steadily increasing demand for education. UC has added four new campuses since this time, CSU has added eight, and the community colleges have added 46 new colleges (UCOP, 2009).

Public Policy and Resource Allocation

While the overall resources committed to higher education in California have increased over time, California ranks fiftieth compared to other states in total funding per community college student (Moore, Offenstien, Shulock, 2011, p. ii). State-allocated funding is a little under the national average, but tuition revenue per student is far below the national average, pushing dollars spent per student into last place. The state's commitment to community colleges is low compared with that of other states and other California branches of higher education (Murphy, 2004, p. xii). California funds its community colleges similarly to the amounts provided to elementary and high schools throughout the United States, with a commitment to charging low fees and "no tuition," and it is the only state to have such a policy. Under funding limitations imposed through tax reform policy, notably Proposition 13's limitations on property taxes (LAO, 1996, p. 10), community colleges, like other social programs in California, operate under difficult financial conditions (Breneman and Nelson, 1980, p. 79). Proposition 98 adds further funding complications related to the uncertainty of state revenues, as outlined earlier.

The resources allocated to each community college often carry a requirement as to how they are spent in the form of “restricted” or “categorical” funding. This categorical funding is less than ten percent of state funding (ACBO, 2013). Prior to the passage of Senate Bill 361 in 2006, funding levels for California Community Colleges were based on Program-Based Funding (PBF). While this practice had been considered “sensible,” it became intricate and provided an incentive for colleges to chase after growth enrollment that might or might not be the most closely aligned to a college’s mission (Murphy, 2004, pp. 31-53). Under SB 361 (Scott), community college funding became more equalized and allowed colleges to make a greater number of decisions locally about how the funding would be allocated to programs. It also maintained a base level of operational funding increased by a per-student allocation, plus funding for special programs under funding restrictions (CCCCO, 2006).

Despite the Proposition 98 funding guarantees covered earlier, the ability to suspend this requirement in bad economic times—as well as a required split of funding with K-12 public schools—adds additional uncertainty for community colleges. Chief business officers at each of the 72 districts attempt to provide budgeting strategies to address the complex, open access, serve-everyone mission of community colleges. According to a January 2010 informal survey of eight regional representatives of the community college chief business officers, the top challenges the CCCs face include the following:

1. Operating within the shrinking state budget for community colleges;
2. Facing the greatest student demand for courses in our history; and

3. Collaborating effectively with all segments of education but essentially competing for the same dollars in the same state budget as K-12, CSU, and UC (Crow, 2010).

The elimination of key personnel and the reduced capacity to serve students through other reductions in resources have arguably landed many colleges in the hot seat with accrediting agencies. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges assesses each California community college every six years based upon the institution's self-study of four standards of quality and effectiveness. The third of these four standards focuses particularly on the allocation of resources and states, "the institution will effectively use its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness" (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, 2010, p. 14). Meeting this standard has become increasingly difficult, given the need to cut equipment and technology budgets, and even to lay off employees or eliminate positions when the state cuts funding to the community college system.

The effects of these previous funding cuts to all branches of higher education linger during a period of high student demand for admission. While it is difficult to quantify how many students are now choosing community colleges because of fee increases or inability to access the CSU and UC systems due to limited space and higher admissions standards, Jack Scott warned that as many as 21,000 students, or 1% of the students attempting to attend California community colleges, could be turned away because of previous funding cuts and reductions in the classes offered throughout the system. Research suggests that the current method of funding higher education in

California and setting policies is not addressing key issues. More intentional steps toward achieving successful outcomes must be taken through new policies that address statewide accountability plans through the use of shared and integrated data (Moore, Offenstein, Shulock, 2011, p. ii).

Current forecasts parallel historical data that show community colleges suffer enrollment declines and loss of student access when funding is decreased. This trend likely will be amplified in coming years if measures are not taken to safeguard community college funding (CCCCO, 2010a).

Chancellor Jack Scott recently proclaimed that community colleges should focus on their “core” mission, which includes the following:

- Transfer to a four-year university
- Vocational training to obtain employment
- Basic skills to qualify for college level courses (Scott, 2010)

Focusing more intensely on transferring students to a four-year university may seem to be in conflict with the Master Plan’s goal to serve any student who may benefit from instruction. A lesser emphasis on personal enrichment and lifelong learning opportunities at the community colleges may be part of the tweaking that the Master Plan needs. That is not to say that community colleges cannot seek local funding to provide these valued services to the local communities. There are many challenges facing each college district to remain viable under an uncertain state funding model while preserving services to the local communities.

The Community College League of California (CCLC) facilitated a commission to explore and recommend what is needed to meet the rising demand for graduates in its

publication *A Vision for Student Success*. The report sets targets for the system to achieve one million more graduates with certificates, associate degrees, or transfer to CSU or UC by the year 2020. The strategies within the CCLC report suggest that community colleges need to focus more on their core mission. Within the many recommendations that span the functions of each college, leadership and appropriate resource allocation are cited as key to student success (CCLC, 2010b, p. 26).

The Master Plan and the many policy initiatives since 1960 guide and restrict CEOs' attitudes, beliefs, and actions in the name of student success. Through a clear articulation of values, CEOs may be able to exert the greatest influence, establishing a vision and mission for colleges to successfully serve students (Bok (336-337)). If student success is defined as completion of a degree or attaining transfer status, CEOs may be able to dedicate resources toward a well-defined mission.

California Community College Presidents (CEOs)

The position of the CEO at California community colleges is consistently portrayed in the literature as providing the leadership responsible for shaping and implementing the mission of the college. The challenges within that role are many and are often made more difficult by pressures coming from the local community and state regulations. Missions are often viewed as roadmaps or directions to achieve an ultimate outcome described in the institution's vision statement (Nevarez, 2010, p. 3). The priorities of the college's vision and mission statements must be clearly articulated before evaluating the degree to which the organization is effective in meeting its mission.

Smart et al. (1997) found in their study that the organizational effectiveness of a two-year college is positively influenced by the leader's ability to incorporate

participatory decision-making and to assume and communicate inevitable organizational change (p. 262). The study also addressed the importance of resource allocation at the college and the negative effects of external influences, primarily the deterioration of available resources and the struggles of any college experiencing declining student enrollment (267-268). While the study primarily focused on organizational effectiveness, it included a measure of the emphasis on mission and concluded that emphasis alone does not have a significant correlation to the overall effectiveness of the college (268-269).

The president or CEO at each college plays a primary role in both shaping and implementing the mission of the institution. Community college CEOs must demonstrate creative and visionary leadership, using their influence to facilitate the teaching-learning process (American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), 2011). Guiding their actions and their visions (Kouzes and Posner, p. 53), the CEOs' values and emphases are also shaped by the expectations of external groups and include a presumption that community colleges will adapt to the changing pressures exerted upon them (Gumport, 2003, p. 47). It is reasonable to suggest that the value each CEO places on the importance of transferring students to a four-year college or university could significantly affect the institutional emphasis placed on that mission. But the CEO also faces uncertainty over which organizational priorities and practices to pursue, "given multiple external pressures and a range of behaviors among successful peers" (Gumport, 2003, p. 40).

Additional pressures emerge because of the high standards necessary to achieve and maintain accreditation. The CEO is ultimately responsible for the college's daily operations, as well as short- and long-term planning goals adopted by its board (Vaughn,

pp. 22-23). The elimination and reduction of key personnel threaten the capacity to serve students and the college's ability to maintain accrediting standards.

Accordingly, Gumport (2003) asked:

How do community college leaders perceive the pressures brought to bear on their colleges and the options that are available to them? What are the implications of these changing pressures and organizational responses for the identity of the community college as an educational institution? (p. 40).

These are “demand-response” scenarios that CEOs may perceive as threatening to their educational values and beliefs about the mission (Gumport, 2003, p. 53). And to further complicate their leadership, CEOs' choices are often restricted by policy decisions made at the state level. In Shulock's *Rules of the Game*, policy barriers are described in terms of impeding student success. The author suggests that policy reform is needed to enhance completion rates, including transfer to a four-year institution (Shulock, 2007, p. 4). The CEO must have clear guidelines from the state that are consistent with achieving student success as defined in the college's mission, or that mission is destined to fail.

The CEO's beliefs, values, and commitment to the mission are influenced by any misalignment that may exist within any of the perceived rules. The “first law of leadership” (Kouzes-Posner, 2007) cautions the leader that “If you don't believe in the messenger, you won't believe the message” (p. 47). Effective communication is an essential leadership competency for all CEOs. The most important CEO communication skill includes the ability to articulate and model a shared mission and values, while delivering the message to the right audience (AACC, 2011, p. 6). The CEO must be perceived as modeling beliefs and values in actions guided by the mission of the college. Higher education research supports the assertion that the actions of CEOs are predictors of the effective performance of their colleges (Smart, p. 695, 2003). The literature and

research reviewed here support the role of the president or CEO as the single most important leader responsible for developing, communicating, and implementing the mission of the community college.

Assumptions and Conclusions

The evolution of the community college mission and specifically the broad mission of CCCs has shaped the role of the CCC college president, the CEO. These leaders' attitudes and practices are heavily influenced by local community needs and state policies that often determine the demand for each component of a college's mission and the resources available to serve students. CEOs have been faced with an urgent need to prioritize within the many missions of community colleges in light of the recent budget cuts to higher education in California and specifically the deep cuts to community colleges.

Transferring community college students to a four-year institution was a primary mission component of the junior college system of California as it was envisioned in the Master Plan (UCOP, 2009). However, as junior colleges evolved into the California Community College system over the past fifty years, the emphasis on transfer has had to compete with many other mission components. A comprehensive examination of college CEOs' attitudes about and practices regarding these multiple missions and the priority that they place on the transfer mission—given the many competing missions—may lead to a better understanding for policy makers and college leaders tasked with identifying misalignments and better reallocation of resources.

CHAPTER FOUR

Methodology

Research Questions

As listed earlier, the two primary research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What is the (degree of) emphasis on the transfer mission at California community colleges?
2. (To what degree) do the attitudes of CEOs at each college reflect a commitment to improving transfer rates?

Related to these primary research questions are some additional queries:

3. What are the emphases of the CEOs at CCCs regarding the relative importance of the transfer mission in comparison to other CCC missions?
4. What is the current commitment to the transfer mission at CCCs?
5. What is the primary mission of the CCCs—transfer or a balance between all of missions?

Site and Study Overview

Primary data for this quantitative study were collected using a cross-sectional survey of California community college presidents and superintendents (CEOs or Chief Executive Officers). Data was collected from selected individuals at a single point in time. This was a single, stand-alone study. The survey was made available electronically to the CEOs of each of the 112 California community colleges. District Chancellors that preside over multi-college districts were not included in the survey. Participants were asked about their beliefs and practices with respect to the transfer mission and related

issues. Demographic data was collected from respondents, but the identities of respondents will remain anonymous, limited to categorizing the colleges by size (see Appendix B, Survey Variables). Identifying information for each college will be kept confidential.

Descriptive analysis was used to compare survey results, noting variance among all CEOs by college type, size, and relevant college groupings. Additional observations or comparisons about college groupings were made using existing Management Information System (MIS) data reported to the California Community College Chancellor's Office, which measures student intent and success at each community college and the type of credits reported at census. From related studies, the study analyzed and compared measures of actual course and program offerings at each college as they relate to the major components of the mission, including a Public Policy Institute of California study that suggests specific changes, modifications to the Master Plan to address the evolving role of community colleges (Johnson, 2010).

Instrumentation

For this stand-alone study, I developed a survey instrument using the cross-sectional method in which the data was collected from selected individuals electronically at a single point in time (Gay, 2009, p. 176, 177). After an exhaustive but unsuccessful search, no appropriate, suitable survey instrument for my research was found; therefore, I designed my own survey instrument using the web-based Survey Monkey, professional version. After receiving direction from my dissertation committee members, I used several sources to guide the design process including texts by Don A. Dillman, Jolene D.

Smyth, Leah Melani Christian (2009) and Richard J. Light, Judith D. Singer and John B. Willett (1990).

The survey used in this research consisted of 20 questions that focus on my research question construct, as well as college demographics and the leadership experience of the participants. Survey questions addressing opinions, beliefs, and practice of the respondents (presidents or CEOs) were primarily multiple-choice, forced ranking, and semantic differential responses on a 7-point interval scale. Additional questions included self-identified leadership experience and demographic descriptions of the college and district in which the college is located.

Key variables for this survey were developed and downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet prior to being coded, and then loaded into SPSS to analyze participants' responses relative to their beliefs and attitudes toward the transfer component of their college's mission. Analysis of variance for semantic differential questions used an interval scale and included computing the mean, standard deviation, and correlation of variables. Appendix B lists the variables and their purpose.

The entire population to be surveyed was approached regarding participation by means of an electronic cover letter containing a link to the survey. Questions for the survey used semantic differential and multiple-choice responses, as well as narrative or comment fields where further explanation was being requested. The survey and cover letter to CEOs appear in Appendix A.

Internal Reliability

Responses to similar questions dealing with an emphasis on the mission statement were tested to check for internal reliability. Questions 8, 9, and 10 asked CEOs about their opinion, beliefs, and attitudes about the emphasis needed on the transfer component of the mission. I used Cronbach's alpha to measure the internal consistency of these three questions about the mission. Cronbach's alpha is the most commonly used test of internal consistency, a general formula for estimating such consistencies (LoBiondo-Wood and Haber, p. 350, 2006).

These survey questions checked proved to be internally consistent, with a Cronbach's alpha of .775. A result of over .70 is sufficient evidence for supporting internal consistency of the survey (LoBiondo-Wood and Haber, p. 350-351, 2006). Tests of statistical significance can be parametric or non-parametric. In order to use a parametric test, three assumptions that must be met: the data must be normally distributed, it must be interval or ordinal data, and the data must be from a random sample.

This data is not composed of interval or ordinal data, so a non-parametric test must be used. Chi square ($[\chi]^2$) is a specific type of nonparametric statistic that is used to determine whether the frequency in some group (category) is different from what would be expected to occur (LoBiondo-Wood and Haber, p. 377, 2006).

When looking at the basic skills vs. transfer mission, the differences in the objectives within the context of the mission and the president's emphasis on the basic skills or transfer mission are statistically significant (chi-square=5.958, df=1, p=.004)

Also significant is the difference between the emphasis the leader puts on the basic skills or transfer mission and the order of priority that the leader gives these missions. (chi-square=9.095, df=1, p=.003).

Data Collection Procedures

There were two primary areas of data comparison and analysis using the data sources listed.

1. Responses from CEOs of California community colleges indicating their experience with their college mission, attitudes, beliefs, and practices related to the mission of their college and its emphasis on transfer students.
2. Comparative analysis of presidents' responses (using cross-tabulation of related questions). Do the responses generally align with practice and is there a perceived need for change?

I collected data using an electronic survey of presidents or Chief Executive Officers designed and linked through surveymonkey.com, which was made available to all 112 CCC CEOs. The link to this Internet web-based survey was emailed to 112 colleges to the president or contact for the president at each of the colleges. Each email carried a unique participant identifier for cross-reference to public college demographic data and other public data listed below as secondary data.

The list of email addresses was obtained through identifying the appropriate CEO at each college by referencing the college's website contact information or directory and verified through the Community College League of California, the professional organization serving these presidents. An initial email was sent to all current presidents

or CEOs, and follow up emails were sent to those not yet responding prior to closing of the survey (see Appendix A).

Secondary data was collected from: the following public sources:

1. California Community College Chancellor's Office Data Mart (CCCCO, 2013a).
2. California Community Colleges Chancellor's website containing demographic and financial data about colleges and districts in the CCC system (CCCCO, 2013b).

Survey Population and Sample Size

The survey of CEOs was conducted with an electronic-response approach, sent to all 112 community college presidents at their primary college email addresses. Given the close professional network of these respondents, and newsletter and email awareness distributed by professional organizations, including the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) and the Community College League of California (CCLC), a high rate of return to the survey was anticipated and a participation rate of 70 percent targeted. Follow up requests for responses were also used. The entire target population for this study consisted of the 112 community colleges in California. The resulting sample or actual participation of CEOs totaled 45 of all 112 colleges, or just over 32 percent of the survey population. The number of CEOs responding to the survey determined the resulting sample size, which in turn affected the precision of the survey instrument. The size of the sample for a specific population can be used to calculate an error rate with confidence level. A desired confidence level is 95%. In this study the sample size achieved a 3% plus or minus error rate at a confidence level of 90%. This is

a measurement of confidence that the sample represents the population. This will be noted as a limitation to this study. A table of sample sizes and population sizes was used to determine the confidence level (Dillman et. al, pp. 55-60, 1990).

While these results were disappointing, falling short of my original 70% target response rate, the respondents represented the single and multi-college districts, ranging from very small districts to very large districts. The 112 community colleges in California currently serve over 2.4 million students (CCCCO, 2013). The number of students currently enrolled at the colleges of CEOs responding to this study cannot be exactly determined but is approximately 650,000 students based upon the size of each college as self-reported by each CEO.

Results were sorted by groupings: college type: (single college districts/multi-college districts) and size (very small, small, medium, large), but individual identifiers were kept private under password protection. Participating CEOs' names or the names of their colleges will not be published.

Descriptive Analysis

This quantitative study uses descriptive analysis and simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) to make comparisons within the group of CEOs surveyed and appropriate descriptive comparisons to public data used for state funding and accountability for the colleges. Survey results primarily measured the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of CEOs at each college.

Limitations and Bias

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of the CEO leadership in the California community college system, in respect to

the transfer mission of the college and any misalignment in terms of the intended mission and the actual practices of colleges related to the mission emphasis on transfer.

Reported results of the survey did not identify individual leaders or the college by name. Results were compared and reported across the system of colleges and separately by groupings in size of district and single vs. multi-college districts. District size could be determined from each completed survey; however, no conclusions were to be drawn from the size of a college in a multi-college district due to incomplete responses for that question.

Significant limitations to this study include the sample size and the representation of college districts by size. Some questions toward the end of the survey received less responses which may be due to the survey instrument. The study focused on the 112 community colleges within 72 districts in California and did not attempt to draw conclusions for community colleges in other states but did draw upon literature and research outside of California that informs the questions asked about California community colleges. As noted earlier, the confidence level at which the sample represents the population in this study was at 90%. This is less than the desired 95% confidence level. Additionally, the sample for this study does not equally represent college districts statewide with respect to district size. CEOs responding to the survey from college districts ranging in size greater than 10,000 FTES but less than 20,000 FTES are under represented in this study, as presented later in Chapter 5.

The bias in my research can be identified within the context of my role as a chief business officer familiar with resource allocation challenges at community colleges. I

hold the opinion that California Community Colleges are funded at a level that prevents any single college from addressing the multiple missions as described within this study.

An additional bias exists regarding my interpretation of the mission of the system of California Community Colleges to mean primarily access to attaining a two-year degree or transfer status at community colleges. The broad scope of missions that include objectives beyond a two-year degree or transfer to a four-year university expends valuable resources that could be focused on a core mission.

In addition to my personal biases, this study is limited because of the small response rate from medium-size colleges. The smaller than desired response could result in receiving more responses from those CEOs that care more about the emphasis on the transfer mission. A limitation when correlating districts by size can result from CEOs misreporting the size of their district. When grouping by size the survey attained valid response rates from the very small and the very large community college districts. Over half of all colleges smaller than 3,000 FTES, 5 of the 8 districts (62.5%) meeting the criteria, responded to the survey. Potentially 100% all of the districts of over 20,000 FTES responded with 23 identifying as a very large district. Only 22 districts meet these criteria. College's CEOs who self-identified as being greater than 3,000 FTES but less than 20,000 FTES comprised only 15 districts (36%) of the 42 meeting the criteria within the population. Districts are listed by total FTES size in appendix D.

CHAPTER FIVE

Results

This chapter provides an overview and comparison of data collected through a survey completed by a sample of CEOs in the California Community College system. These initial observations served as a guide for analysis of the data in the context of the research questions.

The results for the twenty-question survey are displayed in this section, sequentially, as the questions were presented to the respondents. The survey results are organized into four sections: College Demographics, CEO Leadership Experience, Mission Priorities, and Leadership Actions – Support for the Mission. Following the results, several cross-tabulations of data are discussed that address initial observations and initial findings about the data. Chapter Six provides additional analysis, findings, and connections that can be made to the literature and conclusions for the study.

College Demographics

The survey sample for this study included CEOs from both multi-college districts and single college districts varying in size from less than 3,000 full time equivalent students to over 20,000 full time equivalent students. CEOs were not asked questions in a way that would reveal their identity.

The California Community College system contains 112 colleges within 72 districts. Twenty-three districts are designated as multi-college districts, and 49 districts are designated as single college districts. CEOs were asked to self-report the size of their district and college as expressed in Full-Time Equivalent Students, FTES, during the

2010-2011 fiscal year. (Appendix D lists all college districts in the system by size). The sample for this study contained CEOs from the very small college in single college districts to colleges within very large single and multi-college districts. The number of colleges belonging to a multi-college district and those from a single college district somewhat represented the ratio statewide (Table 6); however, colleges from districts ranging in size from 10,000 FTES to less than 20,000 FTES are underrepresented in this sample (Table 7.1). Only 6 CEOs responded from colleges belonging to this segment of the sample out of the 26 districts ranging in size from 10,000 but less than 20,000 FTES. This is a limitation to this study that limits the ability to draw conclusions including any observations based on a college district's size and the allocation of resources within those districts.

The distribution of the sample by college size is somewhat more representative of the statewide distribution of colleges by size (Table 7.2). The evidence suggests that small colleges and small college districts participated in this study at a much higher rate than any other group of colleges measured by size in FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students). The greater participation by any one category of colleges is noted here as a limitation to this study.

Table 6: Single-College District or Multi-College District

	Sample	Percent	Statewide	Percent
Single-College District	18	40.0	49	36.7
Multi-College District	27	60.0	63	42.8
Total	45	100.0	112	40.1

Table 7.1: Size of Participants' Community College District

	Sample	Percent of Sample	Statewide	Percent of Statewide
FTES = 3000 or Less	5	11.1	8	62.5
FTES = Greater than 3000 but less than 10,000	9	20.0	16	66.7
FTES = Greater than 10,000 but less than 20,000	6	13.3	26	23.1
FTES = 20,000 or more	23	51.1	22	95.7
Skipped	2	4.4		
Total	45	100.0	72	

Table 7.2: Size of Participants' Colleges

	Sample	Percent of Sample	Statewide	Percent of Statewide
FTES = 3000 or Less	5	11.1	10	50.0
FTES = Greater than 3000 but less than 10,000	17	37.8	45	37.8
FTES = Greater than 10,000 but less than 20,000	13	28.9	41	31.7
FTES = 20,000 or more	6	13.3	16	37.5
Skipped	4	8.9		
Total	45	100.0	112	

CEO Leadership Experience

CEOs in this study were asked about their experiences as a CEO and specifically the length of their service as a CEO at their current college. I was curious whether or not experience would influence how a CEO would respond to questions about the emphasis they place on the transfer component of the mission. CEOs indicated that just over half had served in the California Community College system as a CEO for five years or more (Table 8) and over two thirds had less than five years of experience as President/CEO at their current college, suggesting a significant turnover in leadership at many colleges (Table 9).

Table 8: Time Served by Participants as a CEO/President (Combined College Experience)

	Sample	Percent
Less than 1 year	7	15.6
1 year or more	3	6.7
2 years or more	2	4.4
3 years or more	8	17.8
4 years or more	2	4.4
5 years or more	23	51.1
Total	45	100.0

Table 9: Time Served by Participants as CEO/President at Their Current Colleges

	Sample	Percent
Less than 1 year	18	40.0
1 year or more	4	8.9
2 years or more	1	2.2
3 years or more	8	17.8
5 years or more	14	31.1
Total	45	100.0

Leadership experience in the CEO position could influence how CEOs responded to questions about the emphasis on the mission components at their college. I used this data later to compare through a cross-tabulation of how CEOs responded to specific questions about the emphasis placed on the transfer mission relative to their experience.

Missions and Priorities

The mission of each college and the emphasis the CEO places on that mission are at the heart of this study. Prior to inquiring about the emphasis of the mission at each CEO's college, this study sought to determine if the mission of a college was current and what degree of involvement the CEO had in developing the college mission. CEOs were asked a series of questions about how they had been involved with the college mission statement, what priority they placed on the components of the mission, and what actions they took to communicate the priorities of the mission. The following analysis and accompanying tables will be followed with a series of cross-tabulations and summary of results.

Most CEOs indicated that their colleges had recently reviewed the mission statement (Table 10), and over 75% indicated that their college had changed or significantly revised the mission statement within the past three years (Table 11). Over 50% indicated that they had been involved or very involved in the change of their mission statements, but at least 20% of the college CEOs had little to no involvement in the review or change of their college’s mission statement (Table 12).

Table 10: Number of Years Elapsed since Review of the Mission Statement

	Sample	Percent
Less than 1 year	23	51.1
1 year or more	11	24.4
2 years or more	5	11.1
3 years or more	1	2.2
Skipped	5	11.1
Total	45	100.0

Table 11: Years since Change in the Mission Statement

	Sample	Percent
1 Year	16	35.6
2 Years	13	28.9
3 Years	6	13.3
4 Years	1	2.2
5 Years	3	6.7
6 Years or Longer	1	2.2
Skipped	5	11.1
Total	45	100.0

Table 12: Involvement in Development of Mission Statement

		Sample	Percent
Not Involved = 1	1	7	15.6
	2	2	4.4
	3	1	2.2
	4	2	4.4
	5	4	8.9
	6	5	11.1
Very Involved = 7	7	19	42.2
	Skipped	5	11.1
Total		45	100.0

CEOs were asked to prioritize five major educational objectives, ranking them in the order. They were asked to prioritize these educational objectives in the context of three primary questions about mission emphasis. First, they were asked about their college's mission. Second, they were asked about their personal emphasis. Third, they were asked what emphasis on the mission they needed to focus to facilitate student success (Tables 13, 14, 15). Nearly 69% of CEOs ranked the transfer mission as the highest priority in their college mission (Table 13).

Table 13: College Mission Priority

Mission Objectives Ranking	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	Skipped
Frequency/Percentage: n = 45						
Basic Skills	4 8.9%	7 15.6%	13 28.9%	15 33.3%	1 2.2%	5 11.1%
Transfer to a four-year institution	31 68.9%	7 15.6%	1 2.2%	0 0%	1 2.2%	5 11.1%
Associates Degree Only	2 4.4%	10 22.2%	5 11.1%	19 42.2%	4 8.9%	5 11.1%
Vocational Education, Certificate or Employment	2 4.4%	16 35.6%	21 46.7%	1 2.2%	0 0%	5 11.1%
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	1 2.2%	0 0%	0 0%	5 11.1%	34 75.6%	5 11.1%

Less than half (48.9%) indicated that transferring students to a four-year institution was most important to the CEO, and 36 (80.0%) indicated that community education and personal enrichment was the lowest priority within the context of the CEO's emphasis (Table 14).

Table 14: CEO Mission Priority

Mission Objectives Ranking Frequency/Percentage:	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	Skipped
n = 45						
Basic Skills	8 17.8%	5 11.1%	13 28.9%	14 31.1%	0 0%	5 11.1%
Transfer to a four-year institution	22 48.9%	14 31.1%	3 6.7%	0 0%	1 2.2%	5 11.1%
Associates Degree Only	4 8.9%	4 8.9%	9 20.0%	20 44.4%	3 6.7%	5 11.1%
Vocational Education, Certificate or Employment	5 11.1%	17 37.8%	15 33.3%	3 6.7%	0 0%	5 11.1%
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	1 2.2%	0 0%	0 0%	3 6.7%	36 80%	5 11.1%

CEOs were then asked where they needed to focus their leadership efforts to facilitate student success among the listed five major educational objectives. Only 13 (28.9%) chose the transfer mission as the top priority to focus their leadership efforts. Eighteen (40.0%) indicated that basic skills was most important (Table 15).

The data represented in Tables 13 through 15 suggest that a disconnect exists in the commitments that CEOs make when prioritizing their institutional mission vs. their own individual mission. CEOs overwhelmingly identify the transfer mission as the number one mission of their college, (Table 13) but less than half indicated that it was their most important individual commitment (Table 14), and less than a third choose to focus on the transfer mission as their number one area of direct leadership involvement

(Table 15). I found this disconnect to be an essential finding in addressing my research questions. As a result I chose to additionally compare the data using cross-tabulation methodology. These additional results are included later in this chapter.

Table 15: CEO Mission Involvement

Mission Objectives Ranking Frequency/Percentage: n = 45	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	Skipped
Basic Skills	18 40.0%	5 11.1%	7 15.6%	10 22.2%	0 0%	5 11.1%
Transfer to a four-year institution	13 28.9%	10 22.2%	14 31.1%	2 4.4%	1 2.2%	5 11.1%
Associates Degree Only	3 6.7%	3 6.7%	8 17.8%	23 51.1%	3 6.7%	5 11.1%
Vocational Education, Certificate or Employment	4 8.9%	22 48.9%	11 24.4%	3 6.7%	0 0%	5 11.1%
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	2 4.4%	0 0%	0 0%	2 4.4%	36 80%	5 11.1%

In addition to the data presented in Table 15, seven CEOs provided an optional narrative response. The following quotes contain sentiments expressed by CEOs relative to the forced ranking of this question:

“Our college does not differentiate priorities among transfer, basic skills and CTE. They are all crucial to the mission.... “

“I do not believe it is helpful to make the false distinction between transfer and Vocational Education - how can one really classify, say Nursing, Business, Photography, Computer Graphics, Criminal Justice - the survey forces a choice - which is not reflective of current reality, many career certificate courses, have

transfer status. - and aren't they all supposed to translate to a career or occupation - so I have reluctantly marked your survey based on current curricular distinctions, and that is unfortunate.”

The data provided in table 15 as well as the narrative responses may suggest that several of the missions are interrelated to each other or even dependent upon one another and create a complexity that does not easily speak to priorities of CEOs. Further discussion of this overlapping of missions will be discussed in chapter 6.

CEOs were asked if the demand for transfer at their college was consistent with study results provided for them indicating that 33% of California’s community college students initially intend to transfer. Twenty-one (46.7%) indicated that the study was consistent with the demand for transfer at their college, 5 (11.1%) indicated that demand was lower, and 14 (31.1%) indicated that demand was higher. (Table 16)

Table 16: Student Demand for Transfer at Your College Consistency with Study

		Sample	Percent
Much Lower at My College = 1	1	0	0
	2	0	0
Consistent with My College = 4	3	5	11.1
	4	21	46.7
	5	7	15.6
Much Higher at My College = 7	6	5	11.1
	7	2	4.4
	Skipped	5	11.1
Total		45	100.0

CEOs were asked if actual transfer rates at their college were consistent with the study results indicating that only 25% of California community college students who plan to transfer actually do transfer to a four-year institution. Twenty-two (48.9%) indicated that the study was consistent with transfer rates at their college, 9 (20.0%) indicated that transfer rates were lower, and 9 (20.0%) indicated that transfer rates were higher (Table 17).

Table 17: Student Transfer Completion Consistency with Study

		Sample	Percent
Much Higher at My College = 7	1	0	0
	2	4	8.9
	3	5	11.1
Consistent with My College = 4	4	22	48.9
	5	6	13.3
Much Lower at My College = 7	6	1	2.2
	7	2	4.4
	Skipped	5	11.1
Total		45	100.0

The majority of CEOs in this study indicated that the transfer mission is the top priority within their college mission statement. They acknowledge that the demand for transfer is significant at their colleges. However, CEOs are less likely to personally advocate for the transfer mission as their top priority, and they are even less likely to become involved in and facilitate actions to promote the transfer emphasis as a part of

their college mission. This lack of advocacy is discussed more fully in the summary that follows the cross-tabulations section of in this chapter.

Leadership Actions – Support for the Mission

The CEO at each college has opportunities to advocate for the college mission and address the allocation of resources to support the mission. This section of the data examined the attitudes and beliefs of the college CEOs when they communicate the mission emphasis and advocate for change in legislation and the allocation of resources.

CEOs were asked to rank the order in which the State of California supports mission objectives through a combination of centralized services and resources, including funding through apportionment allocation.

Twenty (44.0%) of the CEOs indicated that transferring students to a four-year institution received the most support from the State; 33 (73.3%) indicated that community education and personal enrichment were the least supported by the State. The remaining educational objectives as supported by the State were ranked as indicated in Table 18.

Table 18: State Support for Mission

Mission Objectives	Frequency/Percentage: n = 45					
Least Supported by the State = 5	4	3	2	1	Skipped	
Best Supported by the State = 1						
Basic Skills	0	10	14	9	3	10
	0%	22.2%	31.1%	20.0%	6.7%	22.2%
Transfer to a four-year institution	0	5	6	4	20	10
	0%	11.1%	13.3%	8.9%	44.4%	22.2%
Associates Degree Only	2	14	5	12	2	10
	4.4%	31.1%	11.1%	26.7%	4.4%	22.2%
Vocational Education, Certificate or Employment	1	6	10	10	9	10
	2.2%	13.3%	22.2%	22.2%	20.0	22.2%
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	33	1	1	0	1	10
	73.3%	2.2%	2.2%	0%	2.2%	22.2%

The data indicated that less than half of the CEOs in this study believe that state resources best support the transfer mission and the vocational mission, but their responses for next best supported are split primarily among three other missions, as indicated in Table 18. This finding continues to support my interest in inquiring further about why there is an acknowledgment of the emphasis on the transfer mission in the colleges' mission and support from the state but why so many CEOs choose not to place a priority on the transfer mission. As a result I chose to do additional cross-tabulations related to this data as they appear to be pivotal in addressing my research questions.

CEOs were asked what level of emphasis they placed on the transfer mission when they communicate the mission of their college. Nine (20%) indicated they placed the strongest emphasis on the transfer mission, and 2 (4.4%) indicated they placed no emphasis on the transfer mission, and 9 did not answer the question. The remaining responses varied as indicated in Table 19.

Table 19: Emphasis on Transfer in Context of CEO's Communication of the Mission

		Sample	Percent
No Emphasis = 1	1	2	4.4
	2	1	2.2
	3	1	2.2
	4	3	6.7
	5	11	24.4
	6	9	20.0
Strongest Emphasis =7	7	9	20.0
	Skipped	9	20.0
Total		45	100.0

The data suggest that, while a majority of CEOs place at least some emphasis on the transfer mission when communicating about the college's mission, it is not the most important component of the mission or the focus of their communication when they choose to communicate about their mission. This finding, related to my primary research questions about mission emphasis and CEO attitudes and beliefs, prompted me to look at additional cross tabulations that are discussed later in this chapter. One concerning result is that so many CEOs chose not to answer this question. It should be noted that a large

number of respondents did not respond to this and some questions later in the survey. This may be due to the survey instrument or other factors. This may have a limited impact on the findings of this question.

CEOs must make tough decisions when allocating resources or when managing resources under the constraints of state regulations. CEOs were asked to what degree they agreed or disagreed with the alignment of allocations of resources and the mission priorities at their college. Four (8.9%) indicated that they strongly agreed that resources were aligned with mission priorities. The remaining responses varied, as indicated in Table 20. Additional narrative from other open ended questions will be discussed in chapter six.

Table 20: Allocations of Resources Reflect Mission Priorities

		Sample	Percent
Strongly Disagree = 1	1	0	0
	2	2	4.4
	3	1	2.2
	4	6	13.3
	5	13	28.9
	6	10	22.2
Strongly Agree =7	7	4	8.9
	Skipped	9	20.0
Total		45	100.0

CEOs were asked if they thought their colleges should change policies or procedures to encourage more students to transfer to a four-year college. Nine (20.0%) indicated that no change of policies and procedures was needed. It is interesting that no CEO thought that significant change is needed (Table 21). While it is interesting that no CEO thought significant change was needed internally within their own institution, in later questions they do indicate that a variety of external changes are needed in both educational policy and resource allocation.

Table 21: Change of Policies and Procedures Needed to Encourage Students to Transfer

		Sample	Percent
No Change Needed = 1	1	9	20.0
	2	2	4.4
	3	8	17.8
	4	10	22.2
Significant Change Needed =7	5	5	11.1
	6	2	4.4
	7	0	0
	Skipped	9	20.0
Total		45	100.0

This question provided the opportunity for a narrative response. The following quotes comprise all optional comments submitted for this question:

“The key issue is not what my college does but what CSU and UC do regarding admitting transfer students into the universities that are close to the residence of

the student.”

“Very challenging in a rural environment with no public four-year school located within 70 miles.”

“So long as it is balanced by encouraging 2 year Career and Vocational certificates - in areas that can provide adequate salaries - health professions, automotive, cosmetology, nursing, etc.”

“Need to allow community colleges to offer some limited 4 year degrees in certain areas.”

CEOs were asked if they agreed with existing or proposed State policies that set restrictions or incentives for funding community colleges that would result in rationing (prioritizing access) to community colleges to favor students who intend to transfer to four-year institutions. Ten CEOs (22.2%) indicated that they strongly disagreed with policies that limit access and favor transfer to four-year institutions, and only two (4.4%) strongly agreed with policies that limit access to students intending to transfer, and 9 did not answer the question. The remaining responses varied, as indicated in Table 22. These responses are surprising when considering the number of CEOs that believe transfer rates should be improved and consider the transfer mission as their top priority.

Table 22: Policies to Limit Access to Favor Transfer Mission

		Sample	Percent
Strongly Disagree = 1	1	10	22.2
	2	4	8.9
	3	3	6.7
	4	7	15.6
Strongly Agree = 7	5	8	17.8
	6	2	4.4
	7	2	4.4
	Skipped	9	20.0
Total		45	100.0

CEOs were provided an opportunity to elaborate on educational policy changes that are needed in California, specifically related to the community colleges' mission (see appendix F question 18 for all responses). CEOs responded to this question primarily related to three major themes: (1) funding formulas and restricted use of funds; (2) regulations to achieve outcomes that may not be funded; (3) preservation of access or a more focused approach to the mission.

Thirty-six CEOs responded to the open-ended question asking if any state educational policy changes are needed to help them as CEOs to fulfill the mission of their colleges. Nineteen CEOs commented on changes needed to California educational law. These comments ranged from one CEO, who stated that no change is needed, to a

majority of comments, which indicated significant change is needed to reduce the restrictions on colleges.

Multiple responses to this question included a reference to student success and the need to measure successful student outcomes and either to tie them to funding or to fund activities that would improve student success. The most recurring idea within these narrative responses is related to funding restrictions, regulations, and mandates. Specifically, CEOs voiced concerns that it is difficult to allocate resources appropriately when their colleges must comply with the 50% law, requiring a minimum of 50% of the general fund monies be expended on current year direct costs of instruction, e.g. instructor salaries and instructional assistant salaries (CCCCO, 2013b).

CEOs were asked if it was possible to have the current level of open access at their college and adequately address the most important objectives of college's mission. Six (13.3%) indicated it was not at all possible to have the current level of open access at their college and adequately address the most important objectives in their college's mission, 2 (4.4%) indicated that it was absolutely possible to maintain the current level of access and address the most important mission objectives at their college, and 9 did not answer the question. The remaining responses varied, as indicated in Table 23.

Table 23: Current Level of Access, Addressing the Most Important Mission Objectives

	Sample	Percent
Not at all = 1	6	13.3
2	6	13.3
3	10	22.2
4	3	6.7
5	8	17.8
6	1	2.2
Absolutely = 7	2	4.4
Skipped	9	20.0
Total	45	100.0

CEOs were asked to what degree transfer rates needed improvement at their college. No CEO indicated that improvement was not needed. Most CEOs indicated that some level of improvement was needed, and 5 (11.1%) indicated that significant improvement was needed (Table 24).

Table 24. Transfer Rates Need for Improvement

		Sample	Percent
Not at all =1	1	0	0
	2	1	2.2
	3	0	0
	4	6	13.3
	5	10	22.2
	6	14	31.1
Significantly = 7	7	5	11.1
	Skipped	9	20.0
Total		45	100.0

These series of responses seem to suggest that CEOs think that transfer rates are lower than they should be and that demand for transfer is high at most of the community colleges. CEOs further recognize that change is needed but may be reluctant to allow an erosion of access to the colleges in favor of placing a greater emphasis on transfer through changes to state policy.

Cross-tabulations

The preceding sections of data analysis prompted the following cross-tabulations of data in order to better understand the beliefs and attitudes of CEOs expressed priority of the transfer mission.

An initial review of the data suggests that a majority of CEOs recognize that a high emphasis is placed on the transfer component of the mission at their colleges when

asked about their college's mission statement. The most significant finding within this study is that CEOs overwhelmingly identify the transfer mission as the number one mission of their college but less than half indicated that it was their most important individual commitment and less than a third choose to focus on the transfer mission as their number one area of direct leadership involvement (Tables 13 - 15). This finding prompted me to compare the data using cross-tabulation to look for an explanation of CEOs' attitudes and beliefs about the mission.

I performed multiple cross-tabulations focusing on questions 8, 9, and 10, which address the CEOs attitudes and perceptions of the primary mission focus at their college. To test if there were any significant differences when asking about the attitudes and beliefs of the CEO regarding the mission emphasis and the role the CEO would play, a cross-tabulation was performed on these three questions, including segregation by the CEO's years of experience and type or size of their college to see if these factors significantly influenced the attitudes toward the mission emphasis. A cross-tabulation of mission emphasis and CEO experience appears later in this section. There were no significant differences in responses isolated to the size of the CEO's district and college, but small differences will be discussed in chapter 6.

Tables 25, 26, and 27 contain cross-tabulations of Questions 8, 9 and 10. As detailed earlier, question 8 asked the CEOs to rank the objectives in the order of priority within the context of the college's mission. Sixty-eight percent ranked "transfer" as the number one priority within the context of their college's mission (Table 13). Comparing college mission priority to the CEO's mission priority illustrated consistent support for the transfer mission (Table 25).

The next two cross-tabulations produced significant results when comparing the college mission priority and the CEO's individual mission priority when the CEO was asked to prioritize competing missions (Tables 26 and 27).

The evidence seems to suggest that, while a majority of CEOs recognize that the transfer mission is the highest priority component of their college mission (Table 13), a significant number of CEOs have identified other components of the mission as their highest personal priority (Table 26). Far fewer CEOs have identified the transfer mission as their highest priority for direct leadership involvement, although those same CEOs identified the transfer mission as the number one priority for their colleges. CEOs may believe they need to focus on basic skills as a priority to everything else in order to prepare students to achieve any goal at their college. This view seems to be supported in the next cross-tabulation.

Comparing the CEO's individual mission priority to the CEO's leadership involvement/emphasis priority produced a divided result between the basic skills mission and the transfer mission (Table 27). A total of 27 (60%) of the 45 CEOs surveyed ranked either basic skills or transfer as the number one priority within the context of their leadership at their college and within the context of where they thought they should place their efforts in improving success at their college. Twelve CEOs consistently prioritized transfer as both their leadership focus and the area in which they needed to focus their efforts to improve success. Eight CEOs consistently prioritized basic skills as both their leadership focus and the area in which they needed to focus their efforts to improve success. The evidence suggests there is a variation of how some CEOs spend their leadership capital. This is interesting and prompted me to look at additional cross-

tabulations that examine CEOs responses specifically about the basic skills mission and the transfer mission.

Table 25: Question 8 and Question 9 Cross-tabulation

		CEO Mission Priority (Q9)		Total
		Basic Skills	Transfer	
College Mission Priority (Q8)	Basic Skills	4	0	4
	Transfer	4	22	26
Total		8	22	30

Table 26: Question 8 and Question 10 Cross-tabulation

		CEO Mission Involvement (Q10)		Total
		Basic Skills	Transfer	
College Mission Priority (Q8)	Basic Skills	4	0	4
	Transfer	13	13	26
Total		17	13	30

Table 27: Question 9 and Question 10 Cross-tabulation

		CEO Mission Involvement (Q10)		Total
		Basic Skills	Transfer	
CEO Mission Priority (Q9)	Basic Skills	8	0	8
	Transfer	7	12	19
Total		15	12	27

CEOs had also been asked what emphasis they placed on the transfer mission when they communicated the mission of their college in question 14. This question appears in cross-tabulation with question 10, the CEO priority of involvement. When looking at the top rankings, more CEOs indicated that they prioritized their need to be involved and to communicate the basic skills mission than those who prioritized both involvement and the need to communicate the transfer mission (Table 28).

Table 28 Question 10 and Question 14 Cross-tabulation

		CEO Mission Communication (Q14)		Total
		Ranked High	Ranked Highest	
CEO Mission Involvement (Q10)	Basic Skills	14	1	15
	Transfer	3	7	10
Total		17	8	25

This is a significant finding and consistent with previous observations that CEOs are often involved and communicate priorities other than the transfer mission but evidence suggests that the basic skills mission is the strongest priority in the context of CEO mission involvement and communication.

A cross-tabulation on question 8 and question 13 shows a strong correlation that CEOs consistently ranked a perception that the state supported the transfer mission when they identified it as the strongest emphasis within their college’s mission (Table 29).

Table 29: Question 8 and Question 13 Cross-tabulation

		State Mission Support (Q13)		Total
		Basic Skills	Transfer	
College Mission Priority (Q8)	Basic Skills	1	2	3
	Transfer	2	16	18
Total		3	18	21

The evidence seems to suggest that CEOs believe that the transfer mission is supported by the state much more often than it supports the basic skills mission. CEOs who identify transfer as their highest college mission mostly believe that the transfer mission is best supported by the state. This may be a factor that affects the actions or leadership emphasis of CEOs in favoring the basic skills mission rather than transfer but further study to confirm this hypothesis is needed.

Just over 50% of the CEOs in this study have five or more years of experience as a CEO (Table 8). I was curious to learn if experience as a CEO would influence attitudes and beliefs about the emphasis placed on the transfer mission. A slightly higher percentage of CEOs who have less than 5 years of experience tended to prioritize the transfer mission more as their personal mission and the identified college mission than those who had 5 years or more experience as CEO (Table 30).

		CEO Mission Emphasis (Q9)		
		Basic Skills	Transfer	Total
College Mission Priority (Q8)	Basic Skills	2	0	2
	Transfer	2	17 (89%)	19
Less than 5 Years				
Total		4	17	21

		CEO Mission Emphasis (Q9)		
		Basic Skills	Transfer	Total
College Mission Priority (Q8)	Basic Skills	4	0	4
	Transfer	4	22 (84%)	26
5 or More Years				
Total		8	22	30

No significant conclusions can be drawn from this small variance, but it could indicate that CEOs may change their emphasis from transfer to other components of the

mission as they gain experience. Many factors could influence an experienced CEO, including local community influence or a better understanding of student population needs.

Initial Findings

My primary research questions sought to describe whether the primary officer at each college (Chief Executive Officer, CEO) placed emphasis on the transfer mission at California Community Colleges and, if so, what was the nature of that emphasis, both institutionally and in terms of personal leadership involvement. In addition, what if anything, is that CEO doing to improve transfer rates at his or her college? While the Transfer Mission received consistently high prioritization, Basic Skills was also highly ranked by CEOs, depending upon the context of questions asked of the CEOs. These two mission objectives, Basic Skills and the Transfer mission, may be seen as connected by CEOs. The narrative responses listed earlier may indicate a need to prioritize Basic Skills to ultimately lead to improving transfer.

CEOs identified funding or the allocation of resources to colleges as important to the success of meeting mission objectives at their colleges and also gave specific regulatory examples that they thought should be changed or modified to help them be more flexible in meeting their mission objectives at their colleges.

CEOs who participated in this study through the survey have identified that the transfer mission is important and that transfer rates should be improved at their colleges but many indicated that they were most involved with Basic Skills and prioritized the same when communicating their mission. However, it is clear that a misalignment exists between what CEOs say about transferring students and where they choose to focus their

leadership or spend their leadership capital. CEOs hold that the mission of community colleges is still a hybrid of missions, and often that hybrid will vary from college to college. In Chapter Six I explore this finding and the connections to the literature reviewed for this study.

CHAPTER SIX

Findings

This chapter builds upon the initial findings in chapter five as they relate to my primary research questions. I present the findings and conclusions of my study and discuss the connections to the literature reviewed in chapter three. I begin by reviewing my primary research questions that sought to determine the degree of emphasis CEOs place on the transfer missions and their attitudes and beliefs about the mission components of their colleges. Most importantly, this chapter discusses the misalignment of the emphasis placed on the mission and what CEOs choose to do to support and communicate their mission. And finally, I discuss actions CEOs should consider to take proactive measures to capitalize on their mission.

Research Question One

What is the degree of emphasis of the transfer mission at California community colleges?

CEOs were asked three survey questions that sought to ascertain the degree of emphasis CEOs place or perceive their colleges are placing upon the transfer component of the mission statement. Survey questions 8, 9, and 10 directly deal with the CEOs' perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about the mission at their colleges. A cross-tabulation of these questions in chapter 5 and review of multiple narrative responses from CEOs inform further analysis in this chapter, in which I explore a disconnect in the perceived missions of the colleges and the actions or priorities the CEOs selected in response to the survey questions.

A majority of CEOs indicated that they were involved in the development of their college's mission statement. Nearly 70% of CEOs ranked the transfer mission as the number one mission component within their college's overall mission. When asked what emphasis the CEOs placed upon the component of transfer in their college mission statement, just fewer than 50% indicated transfer as their number one priority. On the other hand, when asked where the CEOs' leadership involvement was needed to facilitate student success at their college, fewer than 30% indicated transfer as their top priority, and only 20% of CEOs indicated that they needed to place the strongest emphasis on transfer when communicating their college's mission. Only 8.9% of CEOs strongly agreed that resources were allocated at their college reflective of their mission statements, but this seemed to be offset by comments that complained of regulations that mandated how resources were to be allocated. Still, when asked if CEOs agreed with studies that indicated that transfer rates were a small percentage of each college's student's success, CEOs agreed. Only 11.1% of CEOs indicated that significant improvement was needed in transfer rates while a majority (over 60%) of CEOs indicated that some improvement was needed to improve transfer rates at their college.

Clearly, CEOs place a very high emphasis on the transfer mission when answering questions about their college mission statement, but it is also clear that a large number of CEOs do not place a high personal emphasis on the transfer mission as associated with my second research question related to their involvement, communication, and commitment to improving transfer rates. This misalignment implies that either CEOs are not being clear about their college mission or they are torn

between their primary mission and those mission components that are needed to support the primary mission.

Research Question Two

To what degree do the attitudes of CEOs at each college reflect a commitment to improving transfer rates?

My second research question explores the attitudes and beliefs and the level of commitment that CEOs make to improve transfer rates. Interestingly, CEOs confirmed that transfer rates have been low at their colleges (questions 11 and 12) and that transfer rates should be moderately to significantly be improved at their colleges (question 20). However, when asked about policies or procedures to encourage more students to transfer to a four-year college, (question 16), ironically only a minority of those CEOs responding thought change was needed, and no one indicated that significant change was needed. This is an unexpected result that may suggest further study.

CEO Emphasis on the Transfer Mission

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of the CEOs' leadership of the California community college system in terms of the perceived emphasis placed on the transfer mission of each of those colleges. Specifically, I sought to review literature tracing the history of California's community colleges and the evolving mission as California established a system of colleges. I asked CEOs questions through the survey about the appropriate emphasis for the transfer component of the mission. It is clear that CEOs believe that the transfer mission is an important part of their college's mission. Some believe it is the primary mission, but

many see it as limited by outside factors, including the capacity of universities to receive those students. CEOs also recognize the vocational education component of the mission as a significant mission, but some see the line blurred or even said they believe the two missions—vocational education certificate or employment and transfer to a four-year institution—are often combined.

As discussed earlier, the debate over the purpose and influences of the community college has continued between two theories: one sees community colleges as serving a functional educational role. The other sees community colleges as preventing fulfillment of the four-year degree (Dougherty, 1994, pp. 16, 17). Brint and Karabel describe the community college mission as a “promise of educational opportunity” but observe that, through increased access to community colleges, students in need of remediation may be diverted from the dream of a four-year education. Today’s surge in vocational programs at community colleges sometimes meets with a lack of transfer-level courses, presenting a barrier to transfer success (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p.99).

A thorough review of survey data in the context of the literature review and public data for the current system of colleges makes it clear that, while the transfer mission is perceived by CEOs to be a key component of the California Community College system, CEOs at each college do not equally value the transfer mission, nor do they agree as to how or whether a statewide system should regulate the mission at each college.

Survey responses, actual practice, and the results of studies cited earlier indicate that completion of the transfer mission is a strong indicator of student success; however, in the opinion of the CEOs, a division exists regarding whether transfer is a primary

objective for community colleges, even though a significant demand for four-year graduates exists in California.

Since the establishment of the first “junior colleges” and the subsequent formation of a system of colleges under the 1960 Master Plan, California’s community colleges have been evolving to meet the needs of their local communities, primarily under local leadership and guided by increasingly prescriptive legislation to define the mission or hybrid of missions that each college must meet to receive state funding.

Since the Master Plan was created in 1960, enrollments in California’s public higher educational institutions have increased tenfold to nearly 2 million full-time students in higher education today, even though the state’s population has not even tripled during the same time period. The growth in higher education students has dramatically increased the number of physical facilities and funding resources necessary to sustain these increased enrollments (UCOP, 2009). Despite the tremendous demand for seats in the community college system, only a small fraction of those students who complete classes at a community college actually transfer to four-year colleges or universities (CCLC, 2010b).

California Master Plan and the Transfer Mission

The Master Plan sought to delegate responsibility to the major branches of higher education to serve the students of California and provide everyone access to education. While direct entry into the UC or CSU system came with restrictions—primarily in the form of high school grade averages needed for entry—community colleges were designed to be open entry amid the baby boomer generation and to act as a safety net for all to have a pathway to higher education, which implied a pathway for transfer to

university (Legislative Analyst's Office, 2009c, p.3). Arguably, junior colleges were created primarily to transfer the majority of their students to a UC or CSU. Today only a fraction of students originally intend to transfer and even fewer actually do (*L.A. Times*, April, 2013).

While CEOs seem to be divided about the emphasis that must be placed on students attaining transfer status versus receiving higher priority for basic skills classes, CEOs said in essence that they recognize transfer cannot happen for a large number or even a majority of their students without a focus on remediation and access issues. CEOs were asked about the need for policy change to help them achieve the mission(s) for their college:

“We can't, in good conscience, move to limit access until we make progress in CC's and in K-12 to close the opportunity gap in preparation.”

“Lower than desired completion or transfer rates are generally the result of factors not within CC control—family economics, poor preparation coming out of K12, second language background, and CSU/UC transfer goals and policies.”

“The Student Success Task Force Recommendations address some of the issues that need to be addressed. I do not like rationing, although I think having students become professional students is not a good use of the taxpayer dollars. I would like to see community colleges expand their mission to include limited 4 year degrees, particularly in rural areas where 4 year access is limited.”

Many of the comments made by CEOs in the survey explained their answers, qualifying why they prioritize a component of the mission over another or even stating that the lack of resources and oppressive regulation prevented them from truly leading their institutions in a way that addressed the colleges' real needs. As previously introduced in chapter 5, CEOs see a connection between the basic skills mission and the transfer mission. The narrative comments here seem to suggest that access to higher

education should not be prevented to students especially if they have not received the needed preparation in the K-12 system. If the students are coming to the community college without the preparation they need to be successful then the CEO may focus more on the basic skills mission seeing it as the primary need to increase the opportunity for students' success.

California Community College Public Data

CEOs included in their narrative remarks the need to receive adequate resources and their support or lack of support for new regulations that would redistribute resources to the community colleges. A brief overview of the public data retrieved for this study is included here to provide context for the narrative responses many CEOs included within the survey.

The California Community College system office, sometimes called the “Chancellor’s Office,” serves as the repository for mandated reporting of financial and student information. The table in Appendix D is a combination of financial data and full-time student equivalent (FTES) totals. The 112 districts listed receive approximately equalized funding of a base apportionment amount, plus approximately \$4,560 per FTES, as reported on the State Chancellor’s Office apportionment projections and final recalculations (CCCCO, 2013b). It is interesting to note that the economy of scale illustrated in Appendix D showed that the smaller the district, the higher the cost per FTES (CCCCO, 2013b). Narrative comments obtained from the survey indicate that most CEOs see that funding or the restrictions on use of funding are used as a primary barrier to achieving mission objectives.

As stated in chapter two community college CEOs attempt to maintain multiple missions with a significantly lower funding allocation per student than the universities in California (Murphy, 2004 p. 17). The CEO at each community college must adhere to state policy while also balancing community needs by means of a localized governance structure and influence. Results presented earlier indicate that CEOs vary in their opinion as to whether resources are appropriately allocated for the mission of their colleges. Narrative comments by CEOs in this study reflect an attitude of reform needed mostly in the removal of laws that restrict the use of funding.

Resources and Policy Context

The attitudes and beliefs of CEOs associated with public policy for education range from those that support change to limit access to those who say no change should be made at all. The most frequently occurring responses to open-ended questions in the survey were related to funding challenges and policy restrictions. The majority of CEOs responded to question 15 by saying that allocation of resources related to mission emphasis were appropriately distributed, but that funding or restrictions on funding were a barrier to supporting the mission. Appendix D and E contain public data obtained about college funding and provide college size information by FTES.

The survey provided rich insight from CEOs about the challenges and barriers that they perceive regarding their effective facilitation of the college's mission. While it cannot be concluded from the survey specifically that small colleges face a more significant financial challenge, the dollars necessary per full time student illustrate the effect of economies of scale and the larger portion of funding resources needed per student at small colleges. Appendix D lists college districts in order of size. Total

expenditures shown for these districts average over \$7,000 per full time student equivalent while the very large districts average less than \$5,000 per full time student equivalent.

“Local allocations reflect the mission, but apportionment formulas are not reflective of the cost of the programs in many cases, particularly in CTE (e.g., nursing).”

The preceding quote is in response to an option to comment on question 15 of the survey asking CEOs if the allocations of resources at their college are “reflective of the mission.” Another respondent objected to the forced ranking method in the survey in the same comment option on question 15:

“...questions in ranking Basic skills. AA degrees etc. make it sound as if there is a division of effort and emphasis. This is not the case.”

Other comments from CEOs supported the need to focus on one area of the mission or another:

“Mandate statewide assessment, mandate curricular alignment, mandate up-front services to lead to student success (and fund these mandates).”

“Regulatory restrictions that limit the ability to mandate courses, i.e., orientation courses, student success courses.”

These comments appear consistent with current efforts to legislate statewide standards and alignment of courses throughout the state community college system and regulate what each college might require of its students.

CEO Leadership and Experience

The experience of each CEO may determine to some degree the beliefs and attitudes of the CEO about the mission. Over the 16 years of a study performed by the

Community College League of California, the tenure length of current CEOs of 4.5 years is near the lowest average-length of service since the study began. Retirements and moves to positions out of state continue to threaten the consistency of leadership at California's community colleges (CCLC, 2010a). The survey results of my study were consistent with the CCLC study. Nearly 50% of CEOs had less than five years of experience as college president, and 40% had served less than one year at their current colleges. The cross-tabulation of responses to the emphasis placed on the mission and the length of time the respondent suggests a small difference of emphasis placed on the transfer mission. CEOs who have less than 5 years of experience placed a greater emphasis on the transfer mission when asked where their involvement was needed and when communicating the mission of the college. While the numbers may suggest a complex correlation of attitudes toward the mission based upon years of experience, two findings are possible. Newer CEOs may not be affected by the local influences of their college district or have not yet determined that other missions are more important than the transfer mission. Further study of these phenomena may yield a clearer picture of this possible connection between experience of the CEO and their attitudes toward the mission.

Conclusions

A common mission, or an emphasis on any one mission for community colleges in California, does not seem to exist. The transfer mission at California's community colleges is a major factor in the debate over the definition of student success. However, there is little agreement among the CEOs surveyed in this study about what emphasis

should be placed upon encouraging students to transfer or improving the successful attainment of transfer status at California's community colleges. While nearly half of all four-year graduates in California had also at some point enrolled in community colleges (CCLC, 2010b), it is difficult to find evidence that community colleges encourage or support the transfer mission for more than a fraction of those students attending.

CEOs recognize and support the transfer mission and often rank it as the most important mission. CEOs suggest that you cannot solely focus on transfer, but rather the community college must provide multiple pathways for student success that *may* lead to transferring to a four-year institution. This would imply that many, if not most, CEOs surveyed support a multiple or hybrid mission and resist the implication of regulation to narrow that mission to achieve student success. However, it appears that CEOs are somewhat ambiguous when addressing the transfer mission and the need to increase transfer students at community colleges. While most CEOs agree that improvement is needed, it is not clear how they would make changes to achieve improvement.

As previously discussed, the addition of the once-named junior college in California provided educational opportunities in a new age of economic and population growth in the state. Initially, the junior college attempted to be two institutions, providing both stepping-stones to the university and training of a much-needed workforce in a rapidly expanding society (Douglass, p. 124). However, California now needs a far greater percentage of four-year graduates than ever before, but the percentage of transfer students has diminished in the complexity of the many missions that community colleges now juggle.

Recommendations

California's community colleges are often likened to a "smorgasbord" of educational opportunities. While this breadth can be viewed as a positive circumstance, offering "something for everyone," it also has the potential of presenting students with confusing and conflicting choices, perhaps even sidetracking them to outcomes other than transfer to a four-year institution (Crow, 2014, pp. 14-15). From this study, it is apparent that CEOs have the authority and opportunity to remove at least some of the ambiguity now associated with the transfer mission. CEOs can deliberately focus their colleges on courses and associate degrees that address transfer readiness and, therefore, provide a more discernible and intentional pathway to a four-year degree.

While the data in this study clearly show a misalignment of priorities, they also suggest that CEOs have the power to effect change. If the California Community Colleges system is to be the driving force in increasing the opportunity for students to transfer to universities, CEOs can also consider the power that they have to "walk the walk" and use their "leadership capital" to facilitate changes that promote greater transfer rates for their students. Furthermore, CEOs have the ability to align their efforts in promoting transfer at community colleges and to use their positions to communicate the need for resources dedicated to reversing the diminishing rates of transfer at the community colleges.

Such efforts can be linked with evolving leadership and policy changes at the state level. CEOs should consider embracing the recent policy changes that mandate the creation of courses that will transfer to California's four-year institutions. CEOs should

consider accelerating these efforts while also embracing the state-wide goals to improve transfer rates and other measures of student success.

During the term of this study, efforts within the California Community College system and the Legislature have been initiated to focus on improved student success, which includes measuring transfer rates. Among these are the Community College League of California's report from the Commission on the Future, The California Community College Chancellor's Office's report from the Student Success Task Force," and California State Senate Bill 1440. Each of these efforts (which I will summarize later) identifies the need for increased numbers of transfer students from the community college system, and each in its own way offers tools for CEOs to use to promote student transfer. Indeed CEOs have the unique ability and license to support these efforts and participate in the ongoing conversations about changes to both policy and practice. Most importantly, CEOs have the discretion to stress their own personal emphasis on the transfer mission through their advocacy, championing causes and communicating messages that support improved transfer rates and overall student success.

The Community College League of California released a report in 2010 that provided a vision for 2020. The report of the Commission on the Future suggested new goals for California's community colleges, including benchmarks for student levels of completion. The commission focused primarily on certificates and two-year associate degrees as a measure of student success but included transfer as a measure of success. The commission's report specifically addressed the need to increase associate degree and certificate completions in California's community colleges. A key recommendation reads, "Establish transfer associate degrees that guarantee admission to all four-year

universities with junior standing, as a part of a state-wide articulation system,” (CCLC, 2010b, p. 18). However, the commission also recognized the many other elements and the need to preserve the role of community colleges to serve the residents of California (CCLC, 2010b, p. 9).

Senate Bill 1440 (CCCCO, 2010) *requires* community colleges to develop more courses that transfer to the CSU system. CEOs can embrace these policy changes that require increased opportunities for students to transfer to four-year institutions.

The Student Success Task Force, which was commissioned by the system’s Chancellor’s Office, builds further on Senate Bill 1440 and has provided many recommendations that indicate additional policy changes on the horizon. These recommendations have led to the development of a new “scorecard” for the purposes of evaluating colleges and their progress toward specific goals to increase new associate degrees that transfer to CSU. The scorecard is comprised of a four-tiered accountability framework, each level addressing targets to a different audience or user. The first level provides a report of the state of the system, a high-level view for legislators and policy makers. The second level is the actual scorecard that measures the progress and completion at each college for groups of student demographics, including those with different levels of college preparation. These metrics have been developed to replace a previous accountability, Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC). The third level provides the ability to drill down into the scorecard metrics through the online query tool called Datamart. The fourth and final level is the most detailed level, providing the resources for researchers to download the datasets (Data-on-Demand) that pertains to each metric for their particular college (CCCCO, 2013).

These new policies and resulting changes have the potential to realign resource allocation and perhaps narrow the community colleges' mission to focus more on transfer readiness and occupational training, as indicated in the following statement:

While addressing the basic skills needs of students is a central mission of the community college system, the time and resources devoted to basic skills instruction need to be balanced with the other missions of the system, namely occupational training, college-level academic preparation, and transfer. The Task Force is aware that existing resources need to be allocated judiciously to accomplish these three primary missions. This will involve further prioritizing of the apportionment streams and more directed uses of categorical funds such as those provided for the Basic Skills Initiative” (CCCCO, 2012, p. 47).

The research conclusions of this study suggest that CEOs do have a philosophic commitment to the transfer mission of their college. But the data also suggest that CEOs have an untapped opportunity to focus considerably more of their own leadership on improving the transfer rates and, in so doing, prioritizing transfer as a core mission of their institution. Within this approach, CEOs should consider the potential of aligning other elements of their mission, (such as basic skills or academic preparedness, vocational certificates, and associate degrees) as vertical or contributing components to the larger mission of transfer. In so doing, these critical components can be viewed as significant, mission-centered achievements that are also aligned as markers on the pathway to a four-year degree.

Within the context of my primary research questions, CEOs should consider making a commitment to improving transfer rates and not just promoting other student success outcomes as an acceptable alternative to transfer for most students. CEOs have an opportunity to focus more on transfer as a core mission, which the other components of their mission support. Other mission components listed in this study can be viewed as supporting components of the transfer mission. Basic skills or academic preparedness,

vocational certificates, and associate degrees can and must be vertically aligned to provide a pathway to a four-year degree. CEOs should consider all of these efforts to create intentional pathways for student success in the form of increased opportunities and support for transfer to a four-year college or university.

Research Needed

This study has attempted to isolate the emphasis on the transfer mission as perceived by the presidents and superintendents (commonly called CEOs) of the 112 colleges within 72 districts at the time of this study. This study has briefly described other initiatives to improve student success, as sometimes defined in terms of higher transfer rates. New initiatives are currently underway that will arguably limit the mission of community colleges and prescribe new goals tied to funding only certain measures of student success. During this study, major initiatives have been initiated and proposed as a blueprint for change connected to the 2013 community college system budget (CCCCO, 2013b). The Student Success Task Force Final Report, facilitated through the state Chancellor's Office and published January 2012, defines student success within a narrowed mission that focuses primarily on student completion, degree awards, and transfer to university (CCCCO, 2012). Additional research is needed to determine if CEOs and their colleges will focus primarily on these goals of success and abandon a much broader definition of student success as originally outlined in the Master Plan of 1960 but that arguably placed more emphasis on transfer, (UCOP, 1990).

The relatively low percentage of students attempting to transfer to a four-year college and the low success rate of those who attempt to transfer needs further study to determine how community colleges can change or support their mission to address

student success. In addition, further study is needed to determine the validity of other barriers to success, as raised in this study. CEOs responding within narrative sections of the survey implied or stated that factors outside of the community college system—including the lack of capacity of universities—were to blame for low transfer rates.

Other CEO comments made in this study were consistent with the literature reviewed and placed more emphasis on successful student outcomes expressed in terms of completion of certificates or two-year degrees. The Community College League of California released a report in 2010 that provided a vision for 2020. The report of the CCLC Commission on the Future suggested new goals for California’s community colleges, setting benchmarks for student levels of completion (CCLC, 2010b, p. 9). Additional study will be needed to assess if these new initiatives improve or further diminish the emphasis placed on transfer in California’s Community Colleges.

Final Thoughts

Much is being done to address the need for more community college transfer students in California and much still remains to be done. College CEOs do not dispute studies that recognized the low transfer rates at community colleges (Crow, 2014, p. 58). Yet, a considerably smaller proportion of CEOs indicate that they are utilizing their own advocacy and leadership to improve these rates (Crow, 2014, p. 68-70).

Based on this research and the emerging opportunity that presents itself through contemporary policy reports, legislation, and data, I continue to believe that CEOs have a unique and time-urgent obligation to effect these needed changes. CEOs can inform state policymakers who need to understand how the transfer mission works at the college level to guide their decisions at a state level. They can use their leadership credentials and

capacity to influence local decision makers. And they can harness their beliefs to integrate and align their own missions and to signal their priorities to the academic and administrative leaders and students of their own institutions. In short, I am convinced that the attitudes and leadership practices of the CEO can make a fundamental difference in this critical endeavor and in the lives of each student who is affected by their efforts.

References

- AACC, American Association of Community Colleges. (2011). *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. Retrieved electronically on January 30, 2011 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/competencies/Pages/partc.aspx>
- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2010). *Accreditation Standards*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from: http://www.accjc.org/pdf/ACCJC_WASC_Accreditation_Standards.pdf
- ACBO, Association of Chief Business Officers. (2013). August 6, 2013 Budget Workshop, Categorical Funding. Retrieved on November 1, 2013. <http://www.acbo.org>
- Alfonso, M. (December, 2006). The impact of community college attendance on baccalaureate attainment. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(6), 873-903.
- Bailey, T. (September, 2003). *The Organizational Efficiency of Multiple Missions for Community Colleges*. Community College Research Center. Retrieved May 19, 2012 from: ccrc.tc.columbia.edu
- Bailey, T., Calcagno, J.C., Jenkins, D., Leinbach, & Kienzl, G. (August, 2006). Is student-right-to-know all you should know? An analysis of community college graduate rates. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(5).
- Bahr, P., Hom, W., & Perry, P. (2005). College transfer performance: A methodology for equitable measurement. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 13(1), 73-87.
- Bragg, D., (2001). Community College Access, Mission, and Outcomes: Considering Intriguing Intersections and Challenges. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(1), 93-116. Lawrence Eribaum Associates, Inc.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Boilard, S. (2009). *The Master Plan at 50: Assessing California's Vision for Higher Education*. Legislative Analyst's Office. Retrieved February 27, 2010 from http://www.lao.ca.gov/2009/edu/master_plan_intro/master_plan_intro_111209.pdf
- Board of Governors, California Community Colleges (2001, January 8-9). *Review of Education Code Section 84362: The 50 Percent Law*. Sacramento, CA. Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

Board of Governors, California Community Colleges (2006, November 13-14). *Title 5 Regulations to Implement Senate Bill 361 (Scott)*. Sacramento, CA: Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

Breneman, D. W. & Nelson, S. C. (1980), The community college mission and patterns of funding. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1980: 73–81.
doi: 10.1002/cc.36819803208.

Brint, S. & Karabel, J. (1989). *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900 – 1985*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Burdman, P. (July/August, 2009). Does California’s Master Plan Still Work? *Change*, 41(4).

California Legislature Joint Committee. (1999-2004). Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education-Kindergarten through University. Davis, CA: California Legislature.

California State Assembly. (March, 2003). Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2 On Education Finance. Report retrieved on April 2, 2011 from:
www.assembly.ca.gov/acs/committee/c2/hearing/.../2-03262003a.doc

California, State of. (2010) Legal Info website. Accessed on March 30, 2011 from:
<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (2008). Mission & Vision Statement.
<http://www.cccco.edu/SystemOffice/MissionandVision/tabid/194/Default.aspx>
Sacramento, CA: California Community College System Office.

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. (2011). Senator Padilla Bill, 1440 Fact Sheet, Bill Language, New Education Code. Retrieved March 30, 2011 from:
<http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/StudentServices/TransferArticulationHome/SB1440StudentTransfer/tabid/1809/Default.aspx>

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. (2011b). Chancellor’s Office (home page). Retrieved July 10, 2011 from:
<http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/tabid/179/Default.aspx>

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. (2012). Student Success Task Force Final Report. Chancellor’s Office. Retrieved March 31, 2012 from:
http://www.californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Executive/StudentSuccessTaskForce/SS TF_Final_Report_1-17-12_Print.pdf

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. (2013a). Data Mart. Chancellor’s Office Retrieved March 11, 2013 from:
<http://datamart.cccco.edu/DataMart.aspx>

- California Community Colleges. (2013b). Chancellor's Office. Facilities and Finance. Chancellor's Office Retrieved March 11, 2013 from:
<http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/FinanceFacilities.aspx>
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2006). SB361 (Scott)/Community Colleges Funding Formula Reform. Retrieved December 12, 2010 from:
http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/CFFP/budget_news/handout_sb_361.pdf
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (2008, September). *System Budget Proposal for 2009 - 2010*. Sacramento, CA: California Community College System Office.
- California Community College Chancellor's Office. (2010a). Chancellor's Office home page. Retrieved March 18, 2010 from:
<http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/tabid/179/Default.aspx>
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2010b). System Strategic Plan. Education and The Economy: Shaping California's Future Today. Retrieved December 11, 2010 from: <http://strategicplan.cccco.edu/>
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2013). Key Facts About California Community Colleges. Retrieved July 28, 2013 from:
<http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/PolicyInAction/KeyFacts.aspx>
- CCLC, California Community College League. (2000, December). Fifty Percent Law Background Paper. Sacramento CA. California Community College.
- CCLC, Community College League of California. (December, 2010a). CEO Tenure and Retention Study, 5th update. Retrieved March 25, 2013 from:
http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/CEOStudy_v5.pdf
- CCLC, Community College League of California. (2010b). The California Graduation Initiative: *A 2020 Vision for Student Success for California's Community Colleges*. Retrieved November 17, 2010 from:
<http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/COTF/COTFReportEmbargo.pdf>
- CPEC: California Postsecondary Education Commission. (December, 2006). California Higher Education-Accountability: Goal - Student Success Measure: Four-Year Degrees Conferred on 2006, Community College Transfer Students.
<http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2006reports/06-18.pdf>
- CPEC: California Postsecondary Education Commission. (March, 2007). Accountability: Goal - Student Success Measure: California Community College Students' Degrees and Certificates Awarded and Successful Transfers. Retrieved December 5, 2010 from: <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2007reports/07-06.pdf>

- Cohen, Arthur M. & Brawer, Florence B. (2008). *The American Community College*. 5th Edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Crow, S. (2010, January). Vice Presidents of Administrative Services Survey. Informal e-mail survey of community college chief business officers.
- Crow, S. (2014). The Significance of the Transfer Mission for the California Community Colleges. Dissertation Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M.. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys, The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dougherty, K. (1994). *The Contradictory College*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Douglass, J.A. (2000). *The California Idea and American Higher Education – 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dowd, A.C., (2003). From Access to Outcome Equity: Revitalizing the Democratic Mission of the Community College. *The Annals of the American Academy*.
- Eddy, P. (April, 2010). Leaders as Linchpins for Framing Meaning. *Community College Review*. Retrieved from Amazon.com on January 17, 2011.
- FACCC, Faculty Association California Community Colleges. (September, 1988). Assembly Bill 1725. Retrieved from: FACCC, Faculty Association California Community Colleges. www.faccc.org
- Foundation for California Community Colleges. (2008). <http://www.foundationccc.org> Sacramento, CA: Foundation for California Community Colleges.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G.E. Mills, & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Gill, A.M., & Leigh, D.E.. (2004). *Evaluating Academic Programs in California's Community Colleges*. Sacramento, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Gill, A.M., & Leigh, D.E. (2009). in Community Colleges' Missions: Evidence from California. *Economics of Education Review*, 28, 74-79.
- Grubb, N.W. (2008). Dreams and Leaks, Reforms and Band-Aids: The Transition from High School to Postsecondary Education. In editors' names, *Conditions of Education*, Chapter 4. Berkeley, CA: Pace.

- Grubb, N.W., & Associates. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gumport, P. J. (March, 2003). The Demand-Response Scenario: Perspectives of Community College Presidents. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586, 38-61.
- Heiman, J. (2010). *The Master Plan at 50: Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts—Coordinating Higher Education in California*. Legislative Analyst's Office. Retrieved February 27, 2010 from:
http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2010/edu/ed_coordination/ed_coordination_012810.pdf
- Hill, E.G. (2005). Proposition 98 Primer. Legislative Analysts Organization. Retrieved from website on April 2, 2011 at: <http://www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/PubDetails.aspx?id=1220>
- Hom, W.C. (2009). The Denominator as the “Target.” *Community College Review*. Sage Publications.
- Johnson, H., & Sengupta, R. (2009). *Closing the Gap: Meeting California's Need for College Graduates*. Public Policy Institute of California.
- Johnson, H. (2010). *Higher Education in California: New Goals for the Master Plan*. Public Policy Institute of California.
- Kane, T.J., & Rouse, C.E.. (Winter, 1999). The Community College: Educating Students at the Margin Between College and Work. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), pp. 63-84. American Economic Association.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2007). *The Leadership Challenge*, 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Legislative Analysts Office (LAO). (1996). Property Taxes: Why Some Local Governments Get More Than Others. Retrieved on April 2, 2011 from:
http://www.lao.ca.gov/1996/082196_prop_taxes/property_tax_differences_pb82196.pdf
- LAO. (2005). Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill. CORRECT YEAR?
http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2005/education/ed_21_6870_CCC_anl05.htm
 Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analysts' Office.
- LAO. (2008). Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill.
<http://www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/analysis.aspx?year=2008&toc=1&chap=5>
 Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analysts' Office.
- LAO. (2009). Analysis of the 2009-10 Budget Bill.
http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2009/education/ed_anl09004003.aspx
 Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analysts' Office.

- LAO. (January, 2011). The 2011–12 Budget: Higher Education Budget in Context. Retrieved on April 2, 2011 from: http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis/2011/highered/hed_budget_in_context_011911.aspx#zsee_link_12_1295463086
- L.A. Times. (April 9, 2013). Fewer community college students completing degrees, transferring. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from internet: <http://latimes.com>
- Lee, V.E., Mackie-Lewis, C., & Marks, H. (1993). Persistence to the Baccalaureate Degree for Students Who Transfer from Community College. *American Journal of Education*, 102(1), 80-114). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Light, R.J., Singer, J.D., & Willett, J.B.. (1990). *By Design: Planning Research on Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LoBiondo-Wood, G. & Haber, J. (1998). *Nursing research: Methods, critical appraisal, and utilization* (4th ed.). St. Louis, LA: Mosby.
- Long, B. T., & Kurlaender, M. (2008). *Do community colleges provide a viable pathway to a baccalaureate degree?* (Working Paper No. 14367). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Meier, Kenneth M. (2008). *The Community College Mission: History and Theory, 1930-2000*. Dissertation: Graduate College of The University of Arizona. Tucson, Arizona.
- Moriarty, D. F. (1994). The President's Office. In A. M. Cohen, F.B. Brawer, Associates (eds.), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morphew, C.C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric Across Institutional Type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3). The Ohio State University.
- Murphy, Patrick J. (2004). *Financing California's Community Colleges*. Public Policy Institute of California.
- Nevarez, C., & Wood, L.J. (2010). *Community College Leadership and Administration*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Pincus, J. (1977, January). *The Serrano Case: Policy for Education or for Public Finance?* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*, 3rd. Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Pusser, B., & Levin, J. (2009). *Re-imagining Community Colleges in the 21st Century*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved July 3, 2010 from: http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/12/reimagining_community_colleges.html
- Reed, C. (2009). California's Master Plan: Today & Tomorrow. Testimony to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan. <http://www.calstate.edu/air/documents/Master-Plan-Hearing-ppt-final.ppt>
- Rouse, C.E. (April 1995). The Effect of Community Colleges on Educational Attainment. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 13(2), pp. 217-224. American Statistical Association.
- Scott, J. (2009). *Where We Have Been, Where We Are, and Where We Want to Be*. November 18th address to the Community College League of California, Conference, Pasadena, California. Retrieved on March 31, 2010 from: <http://www.cccco.edu/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=T9ezG3Zuyu8%3d&tabid=191&mid=2540>
- Sengupta, R., & Jepsen, C. (November, 2006). *California's Community College Students, California Counts – Population Trends and Profiles*, 8(2). San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Shaw, K., & London, H. (2001). Culture and Ideology in Keeping Transfer Commitment: Three Community Colleges. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(1), 91-114.
- Shulock, N. (2004). *On the Durability of the Master Plan in the 21st Century, or 'if it's broken, why isn't anyone fixing it?'* Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy. Sacramento, CA: California State University. Retrieved on December 11, 2010 from: http://www.csus.edu/ihelp/pdfs/r_durability_master_plan_02-04.pdf
- Shulock, N., & Moore, C. (2007). *Rules of the Game: How State Policy Creates Barriers to Degree Completion and Impedes Student Success in the California Community Colleges*. Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy. Sacramento, CA: California State University.
- Moore, C., Offenstein, J., & Shulock, N. (2011). *Consequences of Neglect: Performance Trends in California Higher Education*. Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy. Sacramento, CA: California State University.
- Spence, C. (2002). *Proposition 98 & California Community Colleges: A History of Broken Promises*. San Pablo, CA: Contra Costa College.
- Smart, J.C. (December 2003). Organizational Effectiveness of 2-Year Colleges: The Centrality of Cultural and Leadership Complexity. *Research in Higher Education*, 44 (6). Pp. 673-703.

Timar, T. (2003). The “New Accountability” and School Governance in California. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(4), 177-200.

Townsend, B.K., & Dougherty, K.J., Editors (2006). Community College Missions in the 21st Century. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, No. 136. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

UCOP, University of California Office of the President. (2009). *California Master Plan for Higher Education*. Retrieved February 22, 2010 from :
<http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/mp.htm>

Vaughn, G.B. (2006). *The Community College Story*. American Association of Community Colleges. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughn, G. B. (2006). *The community college presidency: 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Appendix A: Survey

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

Instructions for President/CEO Survey

Information about this survey:

This survey is part of my doctoral study in CANDEL, a joint doctoral program of the University of California, Davis and Sonoma State University.

I am analyzing the significance of the transfer mission within the context of the many missions community colleges may have from the perspective of California Community Colleges' Chief Executive Officers.

This survey should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Please choose the most appropriate answer for each question. Your identity cannot be matched to your survey. Data analysis will group responses by size of college and other college characteristics that do not identify the names of colleges, districts, or the individual participants in this survey.

Thank you for your participation!

If you encounter any problems accessing the survey, please contact me at:

stcrow@ucdavis.edu

530-905-8488

Steven L. Crow, ABD

District and College Characteristics

*** 1. Please indicate whether your college is located in a single-college district or a multi-college district:**

- Single-College District
- Multi-College District

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

***2. What is the size of your district and college expressed in Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) as reported to your district office or directly to the state if you are a single-college district for apportionment for the 2010/2011 fiscal year? (number will be the same for single-college districts).**

Choose the answer that best describes the size of your district then college:

	FTES = 3000 or Less	FTES = Greater than 3000 but less than 10,000	FTES = Greater than 10,000 but less than 20,000	FTES = 20,000 or more
Size of Your District	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Size of Your College	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Leadership Experience

***3. How many years of experience do you have as a CEO/President of a California Community College? (choose total years served)**

	Less than 1 year	1 year or more	2 years or more	3 years or more	4 years or more	5 years or more
Time served as a CEO/President (colleges combined experience)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***4. How long have you served as CEO/President at your current college? (choose total years served)**

	Less than 1 year	1 year or more	2 years or more	3 years or more	4 years or more	5 years or more
Time served as CEO/President:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

College Mission Statement

***5. Approximately, how long as it been since your college reviewed its mission statement?**

	Less than 1 year	1 year or more	2 years or more	3 years or more	4 years or more	5 years or more
Since Review of the Mission Statement:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

***6. When was the last time your college changed or significantly revised its mission statement?**

	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	5 Years	6 Years or Longer
Since Change of the Mission Statement:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***7. To what degree were you involved in the development of the current mission statement for your college?**

	Not Involved = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Very Involved = 7
Mission Statement Involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***8. Please rank the following objectives in the order of priority within the context of your college's mission.**

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Basic Skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transfer to a four-year institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Associates Degree only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocational Education Certificate or Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***9. Please rank the following objectives in the order of emphasis that you as a leader place on each within the context of your college's mission.**

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Basic Skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transfer to a four-year institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Associates Degree only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocational Education Certificate or Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

*** 10. Please rank the following objectives within the context of where your leadership/involvement needs to be to facilitate student success at your college, i.e., in what order do you prioritize your efforts for improvement for these mission components?**

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Basic Skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transfer to a four-year institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Associates Degree only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocational Education Certificate or Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Education - Personal Enrichment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Optional: Other Comments:

*** 11. A recent study observed that 33% of California's community college students initially intend to transfer to a four-year institution (Sengupta & Jepsen, 2006). Please indicate if this is consistent with the student demand for transfer at your college.**

	Much Lower at my college = 1	2	3	Consistant with My College = 4	5	6	Much Higher at my college = 7
Student Demand for Transfer at Your College:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 12. A recent study observed that of California's community college students that initially intended to transfer to a four-year institution only about 25% actually did transfer (Sengupta & Jepsen, 2006). Please indicate if this is consistent with outcomes for transfer at your college.**

	Much Lower at my college = 1	2	3	Consistant with My College = 4	5	6	Much Higher at my college = 7
Student Transfer Completion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

Resources and Policy

*** 13. In your opinion, indicate the order in which the State of California supports these mission objectives through a combination of centralized services and resources including funding through apportionment allocation:**

	Best Supported = 1	2	3	4	Least Supported = 5
Basic Skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transfer to a four-year institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Associates Degree only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocational Education Certificate or Employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Education or Personal Enrichment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 14. Please indicate the level of emphasis you place on the transfer mission when you communicate the mission of your college.**

	No Emphasis = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongest Emphasis =7
Emphasis on Transfer:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 15. Please rate the following statement:**

The allocations of resources at my college are reflective of the mission priorities at my college.

	Strongly Disagree = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Agree =7
Allocations Reflect Mission Priorities:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Optional Comments:

Dissertation Research- UC Davis CEO/President Survey - Steve Crow

***16. Do you think your college should change its policies or procedures to encourage more students to transfer to a four-year college?**

	No Change Needed = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Significant Change Needed = 7
Level of Change Needed:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Optional Comments:

***17. Do you agree with existing or proposed State policies that set restrictions or incentives for funding community colleges that would result in rationing (prioritizing access) to community colleges that would favor students who intend to transfer to four-year institutions?**

	Strongly Disagree = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Agree = 7
Limit access to favor Transfer Mission:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***18. What if any state educational policy changes are needed to help you as president/CEO fulfill the mission(s) for your college?**

***19. Is it possible to have the current level of open access at your college and adequately address the most important objectives in your college's mission?**

	Not at all = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Absolutely = 7
Your Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

***20. Do you think that transfer rates at your college need to be improved?**

	Not at all = 1	2	3	4	5	6	Significantly = 7
Your Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Source for questions #11 and #12:

Sengupta, R. & Christopher Jepsen. (November, 2006). California's Community College Students, California Counts – Population Trends and Profiles, 8(2). San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.

Email Cover Letter:

Dear Community College President/CEO,

I am inviting you to participate in a survey that addresses important questions you likely face as a President/CEO in the California Community College system. Specifically, I have chosen to study the relationship between the multiple missions of California Community Colleges and the rate of transfer students to four-year institutions. I am particularly interested in the impact that the beliefs and practices of community college presidents may have upon the mission(s) of their institutions.

This research is being conducted relative to my candidacy for Doctorate in Educational Leadership through the Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL) program, a joint program through the UC Davis School of Education and the CSU Sonoma School of Education.

I am analyzing the significance of the transfer mission from the perspective of CEOs of California Community Colleges. Identities of respondents and colleges will be kept anonymous. Data will only be represented relative to the system as a whole and groupings of types of colleges.

Your participation will be valuable to better understand the transfer component of the CCC system within the context of the many missions your college may have.

The survey is composed of 20 questions and should take about twenty minutes to complete. Your identity and individual responses will not be recorded and will not be linked to you or your college.

The survey is now open and will close on March 30th, 2012 at 8:00 p.m.

Survey link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ZCPG7WS>

If you encounter any problems accessing the survey, please contact me at:

Steve Crow

stcrow@ucdavis.edu 530-905-8488

Thank you in advance for your participation. Upon completion of my research, it is my intention to share a summary of my results with the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) for your review.

Sincerely,

Steven L. Crow

Email Follow up Letter

Dear Community College President/CEO,

If you have already taken the survey that I sent you on February 16th, thank you. If not, this is a reminder that the survey will close March 30th. Specifically, I have chosen to study the relationship between the multiple missions of California Community Colleges and the rate of transfer students to four-year institutions. I am particularly interested in the impact that the beliefs and practices of community college presidents may have upon the mission(s) of their institutions.

This research is being conducted relative to my candidacy for Doctorate in Educational Leadership through the Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL) program, a joint program through the UC Davis School of Education and the CSU Sonoma School of Education.

I am analyzing the significance of the transfer mission from the perspective of CEOs of California Community Colleges. Identities of respondents and colleges will be kept anonymous. Data will only be represented relative to the system as a whole and groupings of types of colleges.

Your participation will be valuable to better understand the transfer component of the CCC system within the context of the many missions your college may have.

The survey is composed of 20 questions and should take about twenty minutes to complete. Your identity and individual responses will not be recorded and will not be linked to you or your college.

The survey will close on March 30th, 2012 at 8:00 p.m.

Survey link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ZCPG7WS>

If you encounter any problems accessing the survey, please contact me at:

Steve Crow

stcrow@ucdavis.edu 530-905-8488

Thank you in advance for your participation. Upon completion of my research, it is my intention to share a summary of my results with the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) for your review.

Sincerely,

Steven L. Crow

Appendix B: Variables

<i>Key Survey Variables</i>			
<i>Question Number</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Values / Coding</i>
College Characteristics			
1	Single or Multi-College District	SingleVsMulti	1=Single 0=Multi
2	College Size	CollegeSize	1=Very Small (3000 FTES or less) 2=Small (3001-9999 FTES) 3=Medium (10,000 – 19,999 FTES) 4=Large (20,000 or more FTES)
2	District Size	DistrictSize	1=Very Small (3000 FTES or less) 2=Small (3001-9999 FTES) 3=Medium (10,000 – 19,999 FTES) 4=Large (20,000 or more FTES)
Leadership Experience			
3	Years served as a CCCC president	YearsServedCCCPres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1 year • 1 year or more • 2 years or more • 3 years or more • 4 years or more • 5 years or more
4	Years in present position	CurrentPositionExp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1 year • 1 year or more • 2 years or more • 3 years or more • 4 years or more • 5 years or more
Mission			
5	Years since mission statement review	MissionReview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1 year • 1 year or more • 2 years or more • 3 years or more • 4 years or more • 5 years or more
6	Years since significant mission statement revision	MissionRevision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 year • 2 years or more • 3 years or more • 4 years or more • 5 years or more • 6 years or more
7	Mission Statement Development Involvement	MissionDevelop	Not Involved to Very Involved Interval scale = 1 to 7

8	College Mission Priority	MissionPriority	<p>Forced Ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Skills • Transfer to a four-year institution • Associates Degree only • Vocational Education • Certificate or Employment • Community Education or Personal Enrichment
9	CEO Mission Priority	LeadershipPriority	<p>Forced Ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Skills • Transfer to a four-year institution • Associates Degree only • Vocational Education • Certificate or Employment • Community Education or Personal Enrichment
10	CEO Leadership Involvement	CEOInvolvement	<p>Forced Ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Skills • Transfer to a four-year institution • Associates Degree only • Vocational Education • Certificate or Employment • Community Education or Personal Enrichment <p>Optional Comments (500 characters)</p>
11	Student Demand for Transfer at CEO's College is 33%?	StudentDemandTransfer	<p>Interval scale = 1 to 7</p> <p>1 = Much Lower 4 = Consistent 7 = Much Higher</p>
12	Those Intending; Only 25% Transfer?	StudentTransferActual	<p>Interval scale = 1 to 7</p> <p>1 = Much Lower 4 = Consistent 7 = Much Higher</p>

Policy Changes and Resource Allocation			
13	State Best Supports Mission Objectives with Resources	StateSupportsObjectives	Forced Ranking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Skills • Transfer to a four-year institution • Associates Degree only • Vocational Education • Certificate or Employment • Community Education or Personal Enrichment
14	CEO Communication Emphasis on Transfer	CEOTransferEmphais	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = No Emphasis 7 = Strongest Emphasis
15	Resource Allocation at CEO College Reflect Mission Objectives	ResourceAllocation	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree Optional Comments (500 characters)
16	College Policy Change Needed	CollegePolChange	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = No Change Needed 7 = Significant Change Needed Optional Comments (500 characters)
17	Agree with Legislation Rationing Education	LegEducationRationing	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree
18	Policy Changes Needed to Support Mission Objectives	PolicyNarrative	Narrative (500 characters)
19	Current Level of Open Access vs. Mission Objectives	AccessVsObjectives	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = Not at All 7 = Absolutely
20	Transfer Rates Need Improved at College?	Transfer Rates	Interval scale = 1 to 7 1 = Not at All 7 = Significantly

Appendix C: Definitions

Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students) [formerly called "average daily attendance," (ADA)] is based on the assumption that one student could be enrolled in courses for 3 hours a day, 5 days a week, for an academic year of 35 weeks---a total of 525 hours per one FTE ($3 \times 5 \times 35 = 525$). This yields a measure of a college's computed full-time students, as opposed to individual students that may be taking just one course or attending part time, often called "headcount" (CCCCO, March 2009).

Transfer Velocity

This study references data obtained using the transfer methodology applied by Bahr, Hom, and Perry (2005) in their Transfer Cohort Report. "The method involves tracking cohorts of first-time college students for six years to determine if they show 'behavioral intent to transfer.' A student becomes eligible to potentially enter a cohort by enrolling for the first time at any California Community College." That cohort is then compared over time to evaluate the success of attaining a four-year degree using state and national data (Bahr, P. R., Hom, W., and Perry, P., 2005).

Appendix D: Districts- Full-Time-Equivalent Students

		Unrestricted			District Size
		2010 - 2011 General Fund	2010 - 2011 Annual	2010 - 2011 Annual	2010 - 2011 Annual
		Total Expenditures	Credit FTES	Non Credit FTES	Total FTES
State of California Total			1,201,109.97	78,497.17	1,279,607.14
8	Less than 3000 FTES				
	Barstow CCD	15,836,863	1,210.83	62.49	1,273.33
	Copper Mountain	11,911,126	1,675.56	67.58	1,743.14
	Feather River CCD	12,142,156	1,729.07	46.06	1,775.13
	Palo Verde CCD	13,376,222	1,745.59	77.21	1,822.80
	Lake Tahoe CCD	13,352,307	1,834.15	49.41	1,883.56
	Siskiyou CCD	16,597,230	2,290.86	70.74	2,361.60
	Lassen CCD	13,013,708	2,407.85	23.05	2,430.90
	West Kern CCD	18,945,708	2,462.95	45.13	2,508.08
16	Greater than 3000 FTES Less than 10,000 FTES				
	Mendocino CCD	19,026,086	3,315.80	139.05	3,454.85
	Marin CCD	44,262,056	4,923.37	158.85	5,082.22
	Redwoods CCD	30,742,956	5,429.21	2.44	5,431.65
	Gavilan CCD	28,618,439	4,893.85	701.41	5,595.26
	Napa CCD	31,754,311	5,762.49	705.80	6,468.28
	West Hills CCD	31,972,204	6,293.91	426.60	6,720.51
	Monterey CCD	40,666,494	6,385.32	450.83	6,836.14
	Compton CCD	27,500,991	6,776.20	83.09	6,859.30
	Hartnell CCD	33,847,311	6,875.43	12.31	6,887.74
	Imperial CCD	36,991,372	7,811.10	0.01	7,811.11
	Desert CCD	38,863,868	7,776.17	938.56	8,714.74
	Yuba CCD	44,900,869	8,890.05	136.99	9,027.03
	San Luis Obispo CCD	51,027,775	9,061.11	200.72	9,261.83

	Ohlone CCD	47,188,011	9,400.99	0.00	9,400.99
	Solano CCD	49,111,245	9,601.76	8.26	9,610.02
	Shasta Tehama CCD	43,864,352	9,815.75	178.49	9,994.24
***	Greater than 10,000 FTES Less than 20,000				
26	Victor Valley CCD	48,522,030	9,859.00	150.74	10,009.73
	Allan Hancock CCD	51,658,691	9,631.60	908.42	10,540.03
	Antelope CCD	58,291,018	10,554.89	14.63	10,569.52
	Sequoias CCD	50,079,682	10,540.41	424.39	10,964.80
	Merced CCD*	53,216,264	9,823.29	1,210.01	11,033.31
	MiraCosta CCD	87,552,254	10,131.88	937.03	11,068.91
	Cabrillo CCD	60,964,325	11,103.12	198.96	11,302.08
	Mt. San Jacinto CCD	55,389,361	11,076.31	618.33	11,694.64
	Citrus CCD	58,552,979	11,445.69	413.09	11,858.78
	Butte CCD	60,714,042	11,580.47	1,026.36	12,606.83
	Rio Hondo CCD	68,179,772	12,671.97	613.86	13,285.83
	Santa Clarita CCD	79,789,711	13,681.34	474.32	14,155.66
	San Bernardino CCD	69,597,449	14,916.58	3.26	14,919.84
	Chaffey CCD	74,154,089	14,662.56	398.54	15,061.10
	San Jose CCD	77,421,305	15,713.47	45.15	15,758.62
	Sierra CCD	78,236,166	15,509.88	405.34	15,915.23
	San Joaquin Delta CCD	83,029,982	16,027.14	156.20	16,183.34
	Santa Barbara CCD	90,670,771	15,482.49	1,872.28	17,354.77
	Southwestern CCD	79,761,507	17,303.41	103.30	17,406.71
	Yosemite CCD	84,941,511	17,335.50	255.98	17,591.48
	West Valley CCD	92,094,444	17,132.63	656.31	17,788.94
	Chabot-Las Positas CCD	101,865,501	17,800.39	58.65	17,859.04
	Glendale CCD	80,950,819	12,664.59	5,512.57	18,177.16
	Cerritos CCD	88,659,405	18,339.19	542.17	18,881.37
	El Camino CCD	108,812,418	19,153.24	0.04	19,153.28
	Grossmont CCD	96,347,263	19,080.58	284.98	19,365.55

22	Equal or Greater than 20,000 FTES				
	Sonoma CCD	100,722,963	17,476.13	3,029.46	20,505.59
	Kern CCD	117,996,244	20,776.67	54.81	20,831.49
	Palomar CCD	102,677,248	19,915.51	927.31	20,842.81
	Long Beach CCD	104,501,589	20,880.30	286.56	21,166.86
	San Mateo CCD*	113,844,491	22,146.86	131.47	22,278.32
	Peralta CCD	119,898,527	22,218.63	146.36	22,364.98
	Pasadena CCD	121,599,447	22,985.02	1,390.17	24,375.18
	Santa Monica CCD	133,912,182	26,708.96	593.62	27,302.58
	Riverside CCD	143,211,375	30,120.96	121.56	30,242.52
	Ventura CCD	136,973,062	29,845.15	539.20	30,384.34
	State Center CCD	143,502,312	31,038.81	158.23	31,197.04
	Mt. San Antonio CCD	141,647,544	26,540.70	6,000.71	32,541.41
	Contra Costa CCD	162,247,434	33,450.53	133.85	33,584.38
	Rancho Santiago CCD	131,673,698	24,268.19	11,168.89	35,437.08
	Foothill-DeAnza CCD	185,183,482	35,322.54	191.54	35,514.08
	San Francisco CCD	199,610,256	25,034.19	10,759.47	35,793.66
	Coast CCD	182,431,781	37,067.40	368.13	37,435.54
	South Orange County CCD	184,260,285	38,747.40	1,452.28	40,199.69
	North Orange CCD	166,919,064	35,098.38	5,439.86	40,538.25
	San Diego CCD	202,372,810	35,248.56	9,235.25	44,483.81
	Los Rios CCD	268,894,843	59,089.51	185.87	59,275.39
	Los Angeles CCD	526,029,063	95,538.57	4,312.60	99,851.16

Retrieved 15-Feb-13

Appendix E: Funding Apportionments for Districts

California Community Colleges 09/14/2011
 Summary of General and Grand Total Apportionments Exhibit B-1
 2011-12 Advance Apportionment (AD) - September 2011 Revision

County	District	State General Apportionment	Total Categoricals (B-2A,B,C, &3)	Grand Total Apportionments
Alameda	Chabot-Las Positas	\$48,253,616	\$3,774,106	\$52,027,722
Alameda	Ohlone	\$22,524,698	\$1,778,910	\$24,303,608
Alameda	Peralta	\$59,073,207	\$7,145,521	\$66,218,728
Alameda Total		\$129,851,521	\$12,698,537	\$142,550,058
Butte	Butte	\$39,189,542	\$11,024,743	\$50,214,285
Butte Total		\$39,189,542	\$11,024,743	\$50,214,285
Contra Costa	Contra Costa	\$56,294,271	\$7,254,440	\$63,548,711
Contra Costa Total		\$56,294,271	\$7,254,440	\$63,548,711
El Dorado	Lake Tahoe	\$8,471,038	\$776,388	\$9,247,426
El Dorado Total		\$8,471,038	\$776,388	\$9,247,426
Fresno	State Center	\$90,316,181	\$7,104,149	\$97,420,330
Fresno	West Hills	\$23,763,232	\$2,009,441	\$25,772,673
Fresno Total		\$114,079,413	\$9,113,590	\$123,193,003
Humboldt	Redwoods	\$16,606,980	\$2,071,063	\$18,678,043
Humboldt Total		\$16,606,980	\$2,071,063	\$18,678,043
Imperial	Imperial	\$26,636,308	\$2,306,117	\$28,942,425
Imperial Total		\$26,636,308	\$2,306,117	\$28,942,425
Kern	Kern	\$48,204,865	\$6,399,858	\$54,604,723
Kern	West Kern	\$6,589,419	\$1,205,016	\$7,794,435
Kern Total		\$54,794,284	\$7,604,874	\$62,399,158
Lassen	Lassen	\$10,117,984	\$881,149	\$10,999,133
Lassen Total		\$10,117,984	\$881,149	\$10,999,133
Los Angeles	Antelope Valley	\$45,385,392	\$3,147,793	\$48,533,185
Los Angeles	Cerritos	\$62,252,616	\$4,233,292	\$66,485,908
Los Angeles	Citrus	\$44,123,387	\$2,567,049	\$46,690,436
Los Angeles	Compton	\$26,485,158	\$2,124,037	\$28,609,195
Los Angeles	El Camino	\$60,926,415	\$4,205,018	\$65,131,433
Los Angeles	Glendale	\$54,980,554	\$4,852,358	\$59,832,912
Los Angeles	Long Beach	\$80,016,785	\$4,944,318	\$84,961,103
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	\$295,117,388	\$30,274,368	\$325,391,756
Los Angeles	Mt. San Antonio	\$99,099,910	\$6,399,713	\$105,499,623
Los Angeles	Pasadena Area	\$71,562,692	\$3,799,757	\$75,362,449
Los Angeles	Rio Hondo	\$50,660,499	\$4,246,636	\$54,907,135
Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	\$48,500,602	\$2,320,582	\$50,821,184
Los Angeles	Santa Monica	\$74,962,216	\$4,215,393	\$79,177,609
Los Angeles Total		\$1,014,073,614	\$77,330,314	\$1,091,403,928
Marin	Marin	\$0	\$2,501,709	\$2,501,709
Marin Total		\$0	\$2,501,709	\$2,501,709
Mendocino	Mendocino-Lake	\$11,748,837	\$1,149,015	\$12,897,852
Mendocino Total		\$11,748,837	\$1,149,015	\$12,897,852

California Community Colleges
 Summary of General and Grand Total Apportionments
 2011-12 Advance Apportionment (AD) - September 2011 Revision

09/14/2011
 Exhibit B-1

County	District	State General Apportionment	Total Categoricals (B-2A,B,C, &3)	Grand Total Apportionments
Merced	Merced	\$36,087,910	\$3,039,716	\$39,127,626
Merced Total		\$36,087,910	\$3,039,716	\$39,127,626
Monterey	Hartnell	\$12,872,128	\$1,844,170	\$14,716,298
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula	\$20,018,115	\$2,108,121	\$22,126,236
Monterey Total		\$32,890,243	\$3,952,291	\$36,842,534
Napa	Napa Valley	\$7,859,606	\$2,289,671	\$10,149,277
Napa Total		\$7,859,606	\$2,289,671	\$10,149,277
Orange	Coast	\$56,124,478	\$8,326,745	\$64,451,223
Orange	North Orange County	\$78,653,824	\$7,981,143	\$86,634,967
Orange	Rancho Santiago	\$78,421,923	\$9,177,345	\$87,599,268
Orange	South Orange	\$0	\$6,364,351	\$6,364,351
Orange Total		\$213,200,225	\$31,849,584	\$245,049,809
Placer	Sierra	\$9,294,857	\$2,972,276	\$12,267,133
Placer Total		\$9,294,857	\$2,972,276	\$12,267,133
Plumas	Feather River	\$5,387,958	\$714,045	\$6,102,003
Plumas Total		\$5,387,958	\$714,045	\$6,102,003
Riverside	Desert	\$14,406,295	\$1,930,159	\$16,336,454
Riverside	Mt. San Jacinto	\$28,634,868	\$2,489,179	\$31,124,047
Riverside	Palo Verde	\$10,791,705	\$954,589	\$11,746,294
Riverside	Riverside	\$90,595,096	\$6,182,743	\$96,777,839
Riverside Total		\$144,427,964	\$11,556,670	\$155,984,634
Sacramento	Los Rios	\$172,215,233	\$14,630,775	\$186,846,008
Sacramento Total		\$172,215,233	\$14,630,775	\$186,846,008
San Bernardino	Barstow	\$11,847,302	\$1,017,973	\$12,865,275
San Bernardino	Chaffey	\$47,694,009	\$3,325,718	\$51,019,727
San Bernardino	Copper Mt.	\$9,234,865	\$728,465	\$9,963,330
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	\$50,228,528	\$3,798,410	\$54,026,938
San Bernardino	Victor Valley	\$35,693,178	\$2,627,012	\$38,320,190
San Bernardino Total		\$154,697,882	\$11,497,578	\$166,195,460
San Diego	Grossmont-Cuyamaca	\$48,719,980	\$4,731,439	\$53,451,419
San Diego	Mira Costa	\$0	\$2,625,852	\$2,625,852
San Diego	Palomar	\$30,776,390	\$4,256,289	\$35,032,679
San Diego	San Diego	\$103,056,893	\$11,032,565	\$114,089,458
San Diego	Southwestern	\$49,286,176	\$4,202,120	\$53,488,296
San Diego Total		\$231,839,439	\$26,848,265	\$258,687,704
San Francisco	San Francisco	\$97,581,242	\$8,213,559	\$105,794,801
San Francisco Total		\$97,581,242	\$8,213,559	\$105,794,801
San Joaquin	San Joaquin Delta	\$46,494,474	\$4,475,849	\$50,970,323
San Joaquin Total		\$46,494,474	\$4,475,849	\$50,970,323

California Community Colleges
Summary of General and Grand Total Apportionments
2011-12 Advance Apportionment (AD) - September 2011 Revision

09/14/2011
 Exhibit B-1

County	District	State General Apportionment	Total Categoricals (B-2A,B,C, &3)	Grand Total Apportionments
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	\$11,775,995	\$1,853,061	\$13,629,056
San Luis Obispo Total		\$11,775,995	\$1,853,061	\$13,629,056
San Mateo	San Mateo	\$34,089,839	\$4,925,570	\$39,015,409
San Mateo Total		\$34,089,839	\$4,925,570	\$39,015,409
Santa Barbara	Allan Hancock	\$30,938,703	\$2,594,424	\$33,533,127
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	\$41,809,181	\$3,440,931	\$45,250,112
Santa Barbara Total		\$72,747,884	\$6,035,355	\$78,783,239
Santa Clara	Foothill-DeAnza	\$56,173,576	\$8,272,404	\$64,445,980
Santa Clara	Gavilan	\$11,215,208	\$1,852,916	\$13,068,124
Santa Clara	San Jose-Evergreen	\$3,082,566	\$4,530,883	\$7,613,449
Santa Clara	West Valley-Mission	\$8,100,982	\$3,785,629	\$11,886,611
Santa Clara Total		\$78,572,332	\$18,441,832	\$97,014,164
Santa Cruz	Cabrillo	\$31,339,377	\$2,717,946	\$34,057,323
Santa Cruz Total		\$31,339,377	\$2,717,946	\$34,057,323
Shasta	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	\$21,806,298	\$2,405,535	\$24,211,833
Shasta Total		\$21,806,298	\$2,405,535	\$24,211,833
Siskiyou	Siskiyou	\$11,292,444	\$984,429	\$12,276,873
Siskiyou Total		\$11,292,444	\$984,429	\$12,276,873
Solano	Solano	\$32,075,754	\$1,861,310	\$33,937,064
Solano Total		\$32,075,754	\$1,861,310	\$33,937,064
Sonoma	Sonoma	\$42,886,938	\$5,095,260	\$47,982,198
Sonoma Total		\$42,886,938	\$5,095,260	\$47,982,198
Stanislaus	Yosemite	\$44,488,707	\$4,238,711	\$48,727,418
Stanislaus Total		\$44,488,707	\$4,238,711	\$48,727,418
Tulare	Sequoias	\$30,891,946	\$2,682,359	\$33,574,305
Tulare Total		\$30,891,946	\$2,682,359	\$33,574,305
Ventura	Ventura	\$62,456,529	\$6,383,883	\$68,840,412
Ventura Total		\$62,456,529	\$6,383,883	\$68,840,412
Yuba	Yuba	\$19,981,875	\$3,015,063	\$22,996,938
Yuba Total		\$19,981,875	\$3,015,063	\$22,996,938
Grand Total	Statewide	\$3,128,246,743	\$317,392,532	\$3,445,639,275

Appendix F: Narrative Responses to Survey Question 18

“No differentiation is made for funding high cost programs. There is no specific allocation for technology. CA is the only state that has a 50% law for community colleges.

“Eliminate local boards of trustees”

“Less micromanagement from government.”

“None”

“Pay for results.....incentives.....do away with FON number for faculty....include counselors/libraries in + side of 50 percent law”

“The 50% Law; the Governance Law; the Fulltime Obligation Calculation and the penalties that come with it when you do not comply; Education in California is not funded to support student success and it is over legislated.”

“Public policy needs to change to eliminate ridiculous impediments to advancing our mission. Specifically, things like the 50% rule, the 67% PT faculty rule, FON, etc. Additionally, California needs to coordinate and integrate the 3 components of higher education taking out program and articulation barriers that impede student success. Finally, the state should assign the task of completely rewriting the education code.”

“Mandate statewide assessment, mandate curricular alignment, mandate up-front services to lead to student success (and fund these mandates).”

“Greater flexibility in use of funds; fewer mandates; eliminate 50% law; avoid outcomes outcomes-based funding; stop apportionment deferrals; provide adequate funding”

“Regulatory restrictions that limit the ability to mandate courses, i.e., orientation courses, student success courses.”

“No comment”

“Adequate funding - more work along the lines of the Transfer Model Curriculum - industry industry-recognized certification that influenced pay grade.”

“The cost and focus of CTE needs to be addressed in our base funding. High

tech and high touch CTE programs cannot be maintained on funding designed to support 50 students in a history lecture with chalk and chalk boards...can't afford dry erase tools!"

"Adequate funding so that not to turn away students. Eliminate the 50% Law. Provide leeway in using categorical dollars."

"Allow CCs to award BA degrees."

"Let us run our colleges to suit the needs of our communities. Stop the micromanagement!"

"Guarantee transfer to a CSU or UC."

"Abolish the 50% Law and the 75/25 ratio mandate."

"None"

"The Student Success Task Force Recommendations address some of the issues that need to be addressed. I do not like rationing, although I think having students become professional students is not a good use of the taxpayer dollars. I would like to see community colleges expand their mission to include limited 4 year degrees, particularly in rural areas where 4 year access is limited."

"Relieve legislative restrictions. Eliminate 50% Law, it only serves to protect faculty salaries and does not allow us to serve students needs efficiently. Eliminate 75/25 requirement, data does not support that full-time faculty are more effective than part-timers. We should be given the flexibility to decide at our campus."

"Fully fund community college education"

"Match funding to incentives and reward success, not just enrollment"

"Reduce regulations/unfunded mandates; block grants"

"Eliminate 50 % law and full-time faculty obligation"

"We can't, in good conscience, move to limit access until we make progress in CC's and in K-12 to close the opportunity gap in preparation."

"No comment"

“Categorical flexibility, reducing mandates, relaxing policies such as the 50% law and 75% rule, relaxing rigid faculty minimum qualifications (e.g, it does not make sense that we need to find a master's degree holder in mathematics to teach basic skills mathematics courses)”

“Fund CCCs at a more realistic rate i.e. K12, CSU, and UC.”

“Stronger direction of CSU and UC to provide transfer opportunities for CC graduates. This might require some constitutional change, but probably not. The state political power has been reluctant to wade into issues of importance to the CSU and UC constituencies, but without doing so, they will likely never achieve significant degree completion goals (such as Pres. Obama's announced goal). State attention on poor completion or transfer rates at CC's is misguided. Lower than desired completion or transfer rates are generally the result of factors not within CC control--family economics, poor preparation coming out of K12, second language background, and CSU/UC transfer goals and policies. (2) Within CCs, the legislature and governor could make a difference by providing guidance and additional funding to address ESL needs and basic skills needs in an aggressive way. Funding stream could be monitored for outcomes (so as not to get trapped in an eternal boondoggle in later years), as long as the monitoring assumptions are based in research (e.g., generally 7 years to true second language proficiency).”

“Eliminate or modify the 50% law, the FON, and AB 1725”

“Greater funding with less restrictions on how state funds are spent as long as the expenditures are within the mission priorities set by the legislature.”

“Basic funding followed by a plan to enhance priority funding for core mission.”

“Change to specific and attainable overall mission as we cannot be all things to all people”

“Change the funding model and build in incentives for measures of success that reflect the student population we serve.”