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Part A

Overview

Listening to the People: Solving California's Higher Education Crisis

The state of California is experiencing a rapid increase in the number of young people of college age. Between 2000 and 2015, 40 percent of the total national increase in 18- to 24-year-olds will occur in California.¹ This surging demographic growth has enormous repercussions for the state’s community colleges and universities, which already are struggling with overcrowding and budget shortfalls. It also presents an enormous opportunity to invest in the future of California and our country.

If current trends in higher education continue, including escalating enrollment demands, it is likely that approximately 1.8 million students — above current capacity — will seek higher education between 2004 and 2013.² Meeting this growing demand is vital to California families and the state’s economy.

A number of studies have documented this anticipated crisis in higher education. This report by the Campaign for College Opportunity is the first to document the perspectives and proposed solutions of Californians who stand on the frontlines of this issue, across every major region of the state.

Over a five-month period, the Campaign conducted the first-ever College Opportunity Listening Tour to raise public awareness of the approaching college-access crisis, and to gain a richer understanding of the related challenges we face and the opportunities ahead. At a time when people feel disconnected from policy decisions, the Listening Tour provided Californians with a forum to come together and engage thoughtfully on an important set of choices related to higher education — choices that will undoubtedly effect the future of our state.

The key points emerging from the College Opportunity Listening Tour reinforce the findings of a statewide survey of 800 California voters conducted by Fairbank, Maslin, Maulin and Associates in December 2004. That survey found strong concern among California voters about the college-access crisis, awareness of the growing number of Californians likely to seek college in the future, and bipartisan support for the concept of the Master Plan that all students wishing to pursue a college education should have that opportunity. The Listening Tour provided an opportunity for a deeper level of engagement with Californians from many backgrounds.

“Listen Up: Californians Respond to the College-Access Crisis” chronicles what we learned on the Tour. The report includes:

- new regional higher education enrollment forecasts through 2013
- six major findings of the Listening Tour
- stories from California college students and quotes from Tour participants
- recommendations for solutions from the Campaign for College Opportunity
- and a listing of organizations whose representatives participated in the Tour.

¹ Source: Education Commission of the States

² This figure represents a cumulative total over ten years. This estimate provided previously by Stacy Wilson, Senior Policy Analyst at the California Postsecondary Education Commission.
Who We Talked To

This unprecedented civic engagement initiative was significant in a number of ways, most importantly for the breadth and diversity of the Californians who participated. The Listening Tour took us from the classroom to the boardroom, inside union halls and community centers across California. Altogether, a total of 1,612 people participated, through 66 events and briefings as well as 100 additional meetings with individuals. Among our tour stops:

- Modesto, where the Great Valley Center hosted a meeting that brought together local business, K-12, community and higher education representatives.
- Los Angeles, where the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, and the Community Coalition hosted a meeting with diverse community leaders.
- Orange County, where University of California Irvine students turned out for a briefing to share their concerns.
- San Diego, where the NAACP and Southeast Community Church joined forces to host a dialogue with African-American community leaders.
- San Jose, where the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group brought high-tech business leaders together, mirroring other regional business leader briefings hosted by groups including the East Valley Jobs Initiative and the Orange County Business Council.

A full listing of participating groups can be found at the end of this report.

Unveiling New Enrollment Data

To provide a valid portrait of projected enrollment demands on our state’s community colleges and universities, we drew heavily on new research by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC).

CPEC’s enrollment report for the community college system was released earlier this year. Also included in this publication are new updated regional enrollment projections for the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) that have been extended to 2013. The full reports for these forecasts will be released later this year. Additional information was obtained from the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU), as well as other sources.

Summer Sandlin, 20, Los Positas College

Summer Sandlin wants to be a high school teacher. Summer expected to be able to transfer to the UC Davis after two years at Los Positas College. But she was turned down by UC Davis despite having a 3.3 GPA. Along the way she had trouble getting the classes required to transfer. “You cross your fingers and hope to get into English 1A. Last year they had to cut tons of classes. It’s getting more and more packed here,” says Summer, now in her third year at the Livermore community college. “Class sizes are out of control. People are sitting on counters and sitting on the floor.” The first in her family to go to college, Summer is convinced that a degree is a key to success. “My parents generation were the last generation that could get anywhere in the world without a degree,” she says. “My generation is looking at getting master’s degrees just so we can get into the field we want to be in and get paid a decent amount of money.”
Part B

The Impact on Community Colleges and Universities: A Look at the Numbers

In 1960, California was faced with its first wave of rapid population growth among young adults. State leaders responded by creating the Master Plan for Higher Education. This visionary plan laid the groundwork for ensuring that every student wishing to pursue a college education would have that opportunity. The plan included the California community colleges, the California State University, the University of California and the state’s independent colleges and universities. In essence, the Master Plan was a promise to our young people that they would receive the education necessary to contribute to California’s future economy and to fulfill their own American Dream.

Today, that promise is at risk of being broken. The state faces a second wave of population growth among young adults — what former UC President Clark Kerr called “Tidal Wave II” — even as the importance of a college degree or vocational training grows even more pronounced. Over the next decade, more than 80 percent of the jobs in the nation’s fastest growing occupations will require some postsecondary education.3 Will California be prepared to compete?

Already, due to population growth and budget cuts, our higher education institutions are facing this problem. Last year, in response to several years of budget cuts, the Governor entered into a Compact with the University of California and the California State University that restores some funding beginning this year and plans for enrollment growth in coming years. This agreement is an important starting point to addressing the state’s long-term higher education needs.

The following synopsis of data on projected student enrollment provides a big picture overview of the pressures facing California colleges and universities.

### Growing Number of High School Graduates

While the large number of California’s high school drop-outs has made recent headlines, what is underreported is that the state is simultaneously experiencing a huge surge in the number of high school graduates. By 2008, California will have an additional 45,000 high school graduates per year. This trend is expected to continue for several more years after that. Each year for the next several years, California will have its largest graduating high school class ever.

---


---

**Annual Number of High School Graduates in California, 2002-03 to 2012-13**

Source: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education based on California Department of Education data.
Projected Enrollment Demand for California’s Community Colleges

Earlier this year, for the first time, CPEC provided an analysis of community college enrollment demand using 16 rather than 11 regional designations. According to the latest CPEC estimates, community colleges will likely need to serve 672,489 additional students in fall 2013, a total statewide increase of 40 percent from fall 2003.

In 2003, an estimated 140,000 fewer students attended community college than were expected, most likely due to reduced funding, significant reductions in course offerings, increased fees and the impacts of the recession on families. After previous recessions and budget cuts, community college demand has rebounded as capacity was restored and fees were stabilized. To regain this lost enrollment and to meet future enrollment demand, CPEC estimates that community colleges will require increased annual average enrollment funding of 3.5 percent statewide through 2013.

The projected enrollment demand will be felt across the state, but is especially pronounced for a number of regions. Los Angeles County alone will likely need to serve an additional 175,000 students, Orange County 80,000 students, and San Diego 60,000 students. The Bay Area as a whole will likely need to serve an additional 107,000 students, while the Central Valley, including Sacramento, will need to serve 100,000 additional students. Certain regions will have an especially high rate of growth, including Imperial, Riverside and San Bernardino counties, as well as the Central Coast.

In terms of institutional capacity (i.e. lecture space and laboratories), based on current space and utilization standards, the community college system may need to expand its physical capacity by as much as half by 2013 in order to meet projected enrollment demands, suggesting the need for creative alternatives to only constructing new buildings.

California Community College Enrollment Demand by Region, Fall 2003 to Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>PCT Change</th>
<th>Numerical Change</th>
<th>Annual Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Northern CA</td>
<td>Sacramento Area</td>
<td>North SF Bay Area</td>
<td>SF East Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>1,655,789</td>
<td>53,607</td>
<td>93,781</td>
<td>65,248</td>
<td>102,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>2,328,278</td>
<td>73,305</td>
<td>137,500</td>
<td>83,891</td>
<td>138,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT Change</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPEC — Note that fall 2003 data are actual enrollments.
Projected Enrollment Demand for the California State University System

Later this year, CPEC will release its updated forecast for the California State University that extends to fall 2013. The data below summarize some of the key elements of that forecast. It should be noted that the CSU will have additional demand for graduate and professional programs that are not part of this analysis.

By 2013, an estimated 119,044 additional undergraduates are expected in the CSU system. State universities in each of the 14 major regions across California will feel the effects of this increase. San Bernardino, with a 62.3 percent increase (6,994 additional students), and the North Central Valley, with a 57.2 percent growth (3,358 more students), have the highest rate of increase. Campuses in Los Angeles, San Diego and Orange counties will have the largest numerical growth in students.

One of the factors driving this demand is the CSU freshman participation rate which is expected to edge up half a percentage. This means that in year 2013, CSU will be serving 11% of recent public high school graduates. Consistent with the CSU’s 1999 compact with the community colleges, CPEC estimates that the number of annual undergraduate transfers from community colleges to CSU will increase from 54,000 in 2003 to 80,000 in 2013.
Projected Enrollment Demand for the University of California

In 2003, CPEC released a report on regional undergraduate demand at the University of California through 2010. CPEC has just extended that forecast to 2013. According to this new data, undergraduate enrollment demand at the University of California is expected to grow by 45,560 from fall 2003 to fall 2013. UC will have significant additional needs for graduate and professional enrollment demand.

Factors driving demand at UC include new freshman students and increased transfer students. Based in part on the UC’s 1999 compact with the community colleges, CPEC estimates that total transfers from community colleges to UC will increase from 14,000 in 2002 to 21,000 by fall 2013. The UC’s Freshman Participation rate peaked in 2002 at 7.6%, measuring the number of students who actually enroll. CPEC estimates that UC will continue to serve 7.6% of recent public high school graduates during this projection period and that this will not be effected by recent changes in eligibility for admissions.

Based on the system’s current level of classroom and laboratory capacity, nearly all regions could experience substantial student overflow. The exceptions are the North Central Valley, where UC Merced is scheduled to open in fall 2005, and San Bernardino/Riverside, home to UC Riverside, where there is additional capacity.

The Capacity of Private Colleges and Universities

California’s 75 independent colleges and universities, otherwise referred to as private colleges, play an important role in meeting California’s enrollment needs. These institutions currently enroll over 125,000 undergraduate students in California and produce approximately 22% of the state’s baccalaureate degrees. Two-thirds of the undergraduate students in these colleges are California residents, 8,500 are California community college transfer students and over 25,000 receive a Cal Grant financial aid award. In the next decade, independent colleges and universities will grow in enrollment between 75,000 and 130,000 students, with about half being undergraduates. Currently, the sector has the capacity to accommodate an additional 20,000 students.4

---

4 Data on independent colleges was provided by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU). These institutions serve an even higher proportion of California’s graduate students, which is not reflected in this report.
Part C

The College Opportunity Listening Tour: Major Findings

A Look Beyond the Numbers

To raise awareness of the formidable challenges facing California’s community colleges and universities in the wake of tremendous population growth among 18- to 24-year-olds, the Campaign launched a five-month Listening Tour in November 2004 through March 2005. We discussed the regional impact of the problem with a diverse cross-section of stakeholders and began a dialogue on potential solutions.

The Listening Tour represents one of the most extensive statewide public engagement efforts on the issue of student access to higher education. The Tour involved 1,612 stakeholders across nearly every major geographic region in the state, including parents, local elected officials, business and labor leaders, high school and college students, high school and college faculty, counselors and other staff, college and university presidents, religious groups and community-based organizations.

Six central themes emerged from our Listening Tour, representing views that many of the participants shared and providing a solid foundation for moving forward with solutions.

1) Limited college access is becoming a major problem and will intensify unless we identify solutions.

When informed that as many as 1.8 million eligible and qualified Californians — above current capacity — could seek access to college in the coming decade, an overwhelming majority of the participants we spoke with agreed that this was an urgent problem which needs to be addressed — and soon. The concern to address this problem was broad-based and bipartisan, reflecting a shared commitment to providing college access for the new generation of young Californians.

Intergenerational Responsibility

Many participants — especially older Californians who had benefited from the original Master Plan — noted that getting accepted to and finishing college is harder today than it was for their generation. They spoke with pride about California’s higher education system and expressed concern about the apparent erosion of the state’s commitment. Many of these participants spoke of an “intergenerational responsibility” to extend the same opportunity to the current and future generations of young Californians. Many tour participants also spoke of the benefits of a college-educated citizenry for democracy.

Growing Competition and Limited Space

As admission standards rise, getting into UC and CSU campuses is becoming increasingly competitive. Once admitted to universities, students face difficulty getting classes, some of which are on two-year rotations or enroll students by lottery. Many participants also spoke about the overcrowding problem at community colleges, describing waiting lists for programs, difficulty getting classes, and difficulty meeting with counselors or obtaining other services. As a result, some students find themselves “getting stuck,” sometimes just a few courses short of their goal. These harsh realities are now common knowledge to many parents and high school counselors who are concerned about what today’s problems will mean for future freshman classes.

“I graduated from high school in 1965 and marvelous opportunities were there that no longer exist today. There’s absolutely a difference in state climate in terms of college access. We should not be comparing ourselves to the standards of other states—we should be comparing to the standards California used to have.”

ANNELLE GRAJEDA, GENERAL MANAGER, SEIU LOCAL 660
Diverse Factors Drive Demand

Most Listening Tour participants were aware that California’s population is growing, but they were not as cognizant of the boom among 18- to 24-year-olds.

Separate from the “Generation Y” population boom, participants also recognized that society’s greater emphasis on a college education is likely to increase demand on community colleges and universities. Interestingly, many people familiar with academically rigorous vocational programs in high schools pointed out that their graduates are also likely to seek higher education at community college or university. As the state increases rigor of both college and vocational high school programs, demand for higher education is likely to increase.

Many Listening Tour participants spoke of the need to go even further to reach students who are not college-bound, particularly in regions such as the Central Valley that have low college-going rates, among ethnic minority groups and specific populations like foster youth, and even large target groups such as young men.

Additional factors, among both younger and older adults, will put enormous pressure on the higher education system. These include:

1) California’s growing need for ongoing job training in community colleges to meet workforce requirements,

2) the need to expand GED programs in community colleges for the large number of California adults without a high school diploma, and

3) the needs of immigrant adults seeking ESL (English as a Second Language) education and other skills, and

4) servicemen and servicewomen returning from military service seeking college education.

At the same time, a number of community college leaders are reporting a decline in enrollment in the past several years due to deep budget cuts that have forced significant reductions in course sections, student services and marketing programs to recruit new students. In addition, many people are concerned that rapid and unplanned fee increases have forced some students to withdraw from college or reduce their course load, especially if they are not aware of financial aid programs. These colleges expect demand to rebound as funding is restored and fees stabilize.

2) California’s future economy depends on an educated workforce.

The Importance of an Educated Workforce

One of the greatest points of consensus from the Tour was the conviction that attaining a college degree or vocational training is a must to meet the workplace demands of today’s economy. Participants noted that failure to do so could result in future workers earning lower wages and contributing less to state revenue. More people, unable to secure full-time work, would be reliant on public health programs. Others also cited the risk of greater crime. We may even experience an exodus of young Californians forced to pursue higher education opportunities elsewhere, a brain drain that is already affecting certain regions such as the Central Valley.

As evidence of the need for more educated workers, participants noted everything from the shortage of math and science teachers to the need for probation officers. Others pointed to the statewide shortage of nurses as the tip of the iceberg with regard to needs within the healthcare
industry for educated workers ranging from lab technicians to doctors. Other professional fields that require skilled and educated workers range from diesel mechanics to biotechnology.

Many business leaders noted that higher education and the quality of the local workforce is a stated factor in deciding where to set up shop. This has been seen as a competitive advantage for California.

The Limits of Outsourcing
A central question that was asked throughout the Tour, especially of business leaders, is whether California needs to make the costly investment in training its own population to meet workforce demands or whether the state can import workers from other states and countries. One business leader noted that the majority of jobs in California are created by local small and mid-size businesses, which are likely to hire locally.

Leaders of global corporations made the point that their companies need trained workers in each of the states and countries in which they operate. Like California, these regions are working hard to retain their talent. For sensitive industries such as defense, jobs must be done by American citizens here in the United States.

Developing a Pipeline between College and Jobs
Labor, business and community leaders proposed that community colleges and universities be more in tune and responsive to the state’s workforce needs. They identified a number of possible ideas to make this happen, including strengthening job placement services, improving student advising on employment options, increasing hands-on learning opportunities, and expediting the development of new education and training programs as new workforce demands emerge.

Participants bemoaned the lack of coordination between community colleges and the state’s workforce development system, including its job training centers, leaving thousands of Californians uninformed about the range of community college programs available to them. There was also considerable discussion of “career ladders” whereby short and long-term training in community colleges and universities could advance workers in a given field. Chico’s Enloe Hospital, for example, was credited with encouraging their administrative employees to enter the nursing field by taking courses at Butte College.

3) Promoting a “culture of college opportunity” must begin at the K-12 level.

Start Them Young
Participants in every region we surveyed agreed that encouraging young people to pursue a college education should start as early as elementary and middle school. To cultivate a “culture of college opportunity” at the K-12 level, people proposed a number of ideas, including better counseling; incorporating information about postsecondary options and financial aid availability into existing curricula, for example, in an economics class; and better distribution and advertisement of college and financial aid information.
Forging a Path to College

Vocational training: Both business leaders and parents lamented the relative lack of information for high school students on vocational programs offered by community colleges that can prepare them for jobs. Many students may opt out of college completely because they are unaware that 1-2 year certificate and degree programs exist. In addition, high school-based vocational programs, such as agricultural programs, can help motivate students to pursue higher education if they choose that path.

A-G and entry into four-year universities: A number of school reform groups such as People Acting in Community Together in San Jose and Community Coalition in Los Angeles, advocated for more college access programs and expanded A-G curriculum, particularly for low-income students to become eligible for admission to university. A-G refers to the listing of high school classes needed for admission to UC or CSU.

Improving student preparation and aligning high school and college standards:
In region after region, we met principals, teachers and students working hard to prepare for college. A number of model programs, as well as regional and state policy reforms, were cited as examples of efforts to better prepare students. Participants encouraged the work of local and statewide P-16 councils, which bring together school officials from pre-school through college. These councils are beginning the important work of aligning mismatched high school and college standards, such as the state’s K-12 English standards’ emphasis on literature compared to the CSU and UC emphasis on nonfiction writing. One example is the Alliance for Education, a San Bernardino P-16 council with strong business participation.

Additionally, CSU has embarked on a number of efforts to improve college preparedness. Among them, an assessment that gives high school juniors advance knowledge of remedial work that can be completed in the 12th grade before they go to college. Some community colleges, such as LA Valley College, are working with local high schools to address remediation issues before students enroll in community college. Outreach programs, such as GEAR UP and statewide AVID and Puente programs are also critical strategies to help students prepare for college.

Concurrent enrollment or dual credit: A significant number of participants statewide recommended that 12th grade education be reconfigured so high school students can complete some college-level work as seniors. For example, the superintendent of the Petaluma School District outlined their strategy, which encourages high school students to use their summers to complete a year’s worth of college credit. While there was some concern about the use of AP courses as a “bonus” for admissions, there was support for expanding Advanced Placement classes or developing other ways for students to receive dual credit for high school and college work.

4) A key way to address the access crisis is for education institutions to share resources and streamline services to increase efficiency.

Participants cited greater efficiency among higher education institutions as a big part of the solution. This report already has touched on a number of efficiency-related proposals, including partnerships between high schools and community colleges and universities. Some additional ideas follow:
Helping Students Graduate on Time

For many students across the state, it has become widely accepted that obtaining a college degree will take five or more years even when attending full time. A number of students, unable to take classes they need because of overcrowding or limited availability, reported having to take classes they did not need to maintain eligibility for financial aid or health insurance. Participants said college advisors and administrators can help students accomplish their goals more effectively and “get out on time” by improving the quality of remediation classes, establishing clearer pathways for degrees, eliminating unnecessary units, offering alternative class schedules and ensuring the availability of high-demand courses.

Better Coordination

Most participants urged better cooperation among community colleges, the CSU and UC systems. Many students expressed frustration at having to take community college classes, including general requirements, that do not transfer to a four-year university. Proposed streamlined practices include adopting a common numbering system for courses and clear rules for course credits to transfer between community colleges and universities statewide.

Among the “success stories” highlighted were City College of San Francisco’s new associate degree program, specifically for students seeking to transfer, as well as the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium’s effort to create a common transfer system across the region. Many viewed having good data as critical to improving efficiency. For example, the Cal-PASS data system (California Partnership for Achieving Student Success) based at the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District is used statewide to track student data from high school through community college and four-year universities. Faculty across segments are coming together and using data to see how to better serve students, with remarkable results.

Not Just Access — Retention and Success

Many expressed concern about poor retention and graduation rates at both the high school and college levels. Several people noted that access to higher education must go hand-in-hand with increased success in graduating students. Among the ideas proposed for improving retention were greater availability of counseling services, peer counseling and an incentive and reward system for institutions that successfully help students meet their goals.

College students and educators noted their frustration in meeting these goals given the current, insufficient support for counselors. A representative of Long Beach City College, for example, noted that there is one counselor for every 1,700 students at their college. A dean at San Francisco State University proposed making counseling mandatory as a way to help students stay on track, while a community college counselor from the South Bay recommended overhauling their system so the college can monitor students’ progress and proactively contact them if they appear to be struggling. Many spoke to the need in the community colleges to advise students at the point of entry, with better assessment and placement services, to help them make better progress toward their educational goals.

Joint (and More Intensive) Use of Facilities and Resources

One community college trustee suggested that community colleges could improve efficiency and reduce costs by working together to minimize duplicated efforts or services such as sports and health facilities. Many participants spoke to the advantages of sharing facilities, such as a
new collaboration between San Francisco State and Cañada College, whereby the former offers classes toward fulfilling a bachelor’s degree at the latter. Others recommended online classes and more intensive use of facilities such as the Imperial Valley College’s FastTrack weekend program, which offers flexible schedules for working people. Systemwide purchasing, as is being proposed at the University of California, was another example of potential efficiency.

**The Limits of Efficiency**

Several participants stated that community colleges are already doing a lot with very little and that these “efficiency ideas” will place additional strain on an already overburdened system. CSU and UC representatives also pointed out the challenges they’ve faced after several years of budget cuts.

Many spoke of the need for full-time faculty and the risk of relying too much on part-time faculty. Some community college administrators spoke of burdensome state rules that limit their ability to allocate resources effectively. One university president was clear that any gains in efficiency should not come at the expense of quality. Along the same vein, business leaders cautioned against turning institutions of higher learning into factories that churn out college graduates who lack the necessary qualifications. Equity advocates expressed concerns that colleges, in their effort to do more with less, not shut out students who may require additional services to succeed by selecting only the cream of the crop to meet achievement standards.

However, Tour participants were unanimous that, by adopting better practices to improve efficiency, community colleges and universities could better serve currently enrolled students in reaching their goals as well as create enrollment opportunities for new students.

5) More state funding is an important part of the solution.

Overwhelmingly, participants agreed that more state funding for higher education must play a key role in solving the access crisis. Given the state’s long-term budget problems, the discussion on where the money would come from prompted thoughtful and sometimes spirited discussion as participants grappled with tough choices.

**An Investment in the State’s Future**

Participants spoke with great pride about California’s system of higher education and the remarkable contribution it has made to the state’s society and economy over the past 50 years. People across the state spoke of higher education as an investment in the state’s future. A number of people expressed concern over the declining share of the state budget invested in higher education over the past several decades.

**Proposed Sources of State Funding**

Participants proposed a variety of potential revenue sources for increased funding to meet enrollment demands. Some advocated for tax increases given that state funds are already stretched thin for a range of state programs because of the budget crisis. Among the proposals were increased taxes on the wealthy, businesses, casinos, vending machines, movies, cars, brand-name clothes, alcohol, tobacco, attorneys and chain stores. Several participants said that many businesses are already doing their share through the taxes they currently pay and their support for higher education through existing partnerships with colleges. Others opposed any form of tax hike saying the state should use funds from existing sources or from moderate economic growth.
A number of participants suggested shifting priorities within the state budget to address the anticipated enrollment growth. Some community college advocates said, as K-12 enrollment slows, colleges should receive a larger share of Proposition 98 funding, which stipulates that a minimum amount of state funding be guaranteed for elementary and secondary schools and community colleges. This point was contentious as many others, including college leaders, underscored the needs of K-12 schools to send better prepared students on to college. Many people pointed to the growth of the state prison budget and cited it as a potential opportunity to shift resources to pay for higher education.

Several participants noted that more state funding would not necessarily translate into greater access. They wanted assurances that any allocation for higher education be directly linked to serving more students, rather than for research or other purposes. Others urged that funding be set aside as incentives for campuses that successfully enable more students to reach their educational goals.

While most participants believed that state funding is an important piece of the solution, several expressed both skepticism and cynicism that government would do what it takes to address this crisis. Many encouraged more partnerships with business, such as Agilent’s support for engineering students at Sonoma State University and Sutter Hospital’s support of Los Rios Community College District’s nursing programs. Overall, participants agreed that additional state funding is an important part of the solution.

6) Tuition revenue and financial aid must play a role in solving this crisis.

Possible increases to fees — with additional financial aid — generated the broadest range of opinions from participants. Some proposed a return to tuition-free college education. Others insisted that this is no longer a realistic option. There was considerable concern that significant recent fee increases occurred too quickly, with some occurring mid-semester, forcing students to pay twice. Other participants felt that California higher education fees are reasonable and that students and their families should be asked to pay more, if they can afford it. The preferred way to do this was to raise fees for all students, but provide financial aid for those who need it, rather than a sliding fee schedule based on income. Some expressed skepticism that financial aid can mitigate fee increases for all who would need it and urged a review of financial aid eligibility standards. Participants often stated the core value that no student be denied a college education because of his or her income status.

The Role of Financial Aid

There was considerable support for the state’s financial aid programs, including Board of Governor waivers in the community colleges and the Cal Grant program. Many participants noted the importance of Cal Grant scholarships for low-income students that attend public as well as private colleges. Participants also recognized that many older students who are financially eligible for Cal Grant do not receive it due to a limited number of scholarships.

Participants also expressed concern about students who are ineligible for financial aid. They include undocumented students, students whose parents are unwilling to support them financially but who are not independent, and those whose income or asset brackets exceeds the cut-off points for aid. As fee policies are developed, participants urged consideration not only for low-income students but for students from middle income families who are eligible for less financial aid.
The Role of Student Loans

Several higher education leaders and students identified the need to expand more grants and scholarships for students in place of over-reliance on loans, which has resulted in many students finishing college saddled with $20,000 or more of debt. Many children from immigrant families, participants noted, are reluctant to take out debt for any purpose, let alone higher education. At the same time, a number of participants said student loans can be a good investment, especially if students are better educated on the relative advantages of student loans compared to working while in school. Noting the high cost of living, other participants said loan “forgiveness” programs should be expanded for certain careers such as teaching or public service.

Raising Awareness of Financial Aid, Streamlining the Process

That many students and their parents are unaware of the full range of state and federal financial aid programs available was cited as a significant barrier — but one that can be fixed. Among the proposed solutions: 1) create a public education program aimed at parents that begins in middle school to communicate that college is within reach and that aid is available; and 2) consolidate financial aid resources and applications under one umbrella program to help students better understand and navigate their options. A high school counselor from Modesto City Schools outlined their campaign to get more of their seniors applying for aid with great success.

The Total Cost of Going to College

Many participants noted the high cost of living, due to housing and other factors, that create barriers for students to go to college. In San Diego, the Bay Area, and other high-cost areas, several participants proposed that financial aid eligibility be adjusted for the region’s cost of living. In nearly every region, students, parents, counselors and others cited the “out of control” high cost of books as a significant barrier, for many even bigger than the cost of fees. Participants recommended ways to reduce the cost of books, including providing more copies in the library, online course materials, or other alternative uses of technology to deliver course content at lower cost.

Tuition Hikes Should Be Predictable

Several participants said increased fees should be predictable and only raised by a certain percentage from year to year so families can plan ahead for their education. There was considerable concern that rapid and unplanned increases have been detrimental. Participants also spoke to the need for fee revenue to be used for improving the quality of programs or to fund additional enrollment, not to offset state budget cuts. Otherwise students are paying more for less.

The Hidden Cost of Time and Money

Given that so many students are working to pay for school, a major concern was the lack of courses when students need them. Participants also pushed for a more streamlined approach to help students reach their educational goals, which could involve reducing unnecessary units to make a degree faster to complete, and thus make college more affordable.

“It is fair for students to pay a portion of the cost of our education, but we still have students who won’t qualify for financial aid and they won’t be able to pay for the increased tuition.”
LORENA CORONA, STUDENT AT CHAFFEY COLLEGE

“College is, in this technological society, the key to having a successful life, for opportunity, and for advancement. That opportunity to go to college is now a stumbling block. California was a leader in higher education access and affordability, now it is becoming more out of reach for many.”
DOUG ODEN, PRESIDENT SAN DIEGO BRANCH NAACP
Listening Tour Findings Reinforced by Quantitative Research

Listening Tour participants were asked to rate three potential solutions — increased efficiency, increased state funding, and increased tuition from those who can afford it. There was overwhelming and unified support for increasing efficiency and state funding, but more moderate support for the proposal of increasing fees for students who can afford it. The findings from the Listening Tour mirrored quantitative research the Campaign for College Opportunity conducted in December 2004. A poll of 800 likely voters across the state found 66 percent support for the vision outlined in the Master Plan, promising access to an affordable college education for every eligible Californian, instead of restricting access because of tough budget times. The poll also found significant support for increased efficiency and more state funding to support California’s colleges and universities.

Listening Tour Tally

TOTAL NUMBER WHO COMPLETED THIS SECTION: 712

“How much do you think each of the options below can contribute to a solution for ensuring college opportunity for all eligible Californians?”

**Increased efficiency of resources among higher education institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More state funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increased tuition for those who can afford it**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This data is not based on a random sample. It is not a scientific survey.
Part D

Regional Highlights

While the diverse constituents who took part in the Listening Tour voiced many similar concerns, a number of region-specific priorities emerged as well. These are discussed below and point to areas where different considerations should be taken into account in public policy discussions.

Bay Area

Bay Area participants were particularly concerned about the disproportionate effects of the access crisis on Latino and African American students. They said that efforts should be made to provide higher education opportunities to all Californians to ensure the success of the state as a whole.

In this region, participants also noted that the high cost of housing presents challenges to students as well as in retaining and recruiting people to meet local workforce demands. Many college leaders also spoke to the limited physical space for their campuses to grow.

Central Valley

In the Central Valley, participants were eager to see collaboration between the business sector and higher education in order to better align students’ educational experience with workforce needs, such as in agriculture, as well as in other industries. Specifically, participants noted that vocational or trade programs had to take into account the development of appropriate skills as they pertain to the Valley. For example, a traditional plumbing program in a community college might not meet the requirements of plumbers who practice their trade in the Central Valley’s agricultural environment. Participants also emphasized workforce development, so that the regional population is able to pursue their education and find local employment to prevent further “brain drain” from the area. On the positive side, the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium is working to address these issues on a regional basis.

San Bernardino and Riverside

Meeting local workforce demand in this booming region was an urgent refrain among participants from San Bernardino and Riverside. They were especially supportive of collaborative solutions to the higher education access problem. Among the effective solutions they highlighted were programs that encourage higher education institutions to join forces with K-12 institutions and local businesses, including local P-16 Councils.

Several business leaders shared examples of successful partnerships with community colleges to meet specific workforce demands including projects that helped improve the skills of entry-level workers. Colleges cited these partnerships as great opportunities to meet the demand of local businesses and introduce entry level workers into a college environment where they can expand their skills and training.
Los Angeles County

In this region, many participants were concerned about the college-access crisis facing the state, but were equally concerned about retention problems and dropout rates at college and universities. Participants suggested that solutions to the access issues should be coupled with solutions for improving student success and retention once they get into college. In particular, there was concern that the increased crowding at local community colleges is making it difficult for students to accomplish their goals in a timely manner.

Participants in this region were also keen on grassroots parent and student involvement as a key strategy for developing solutions and encouraging increased college participation rates among low-income students.

Orange County

According to a 2003 report on Orange County’s workforce needs, the region is experiencing growth among computer scientists and related professions in the high-tech field as well as teachers. Several participants shared the concern that the local population is not attaining the skills necessary to fulfill the workforce demands of the region.

Participants across various constituencies also expressed concern over the high cost of housing and the effect that these costs have in recruiting and retaining professional workers to the area, especially “first responders” such as police officers, firefighters and nurses. Training the local population to fill these and other employment needs was cited as a high priority.

Sacramento

In Sacramento, participants were well aware of the escalating population growth in their region and the potential disproportionate demands for higher education. Because the region is growing in many directions at once, higher education has responded on a regional basis. Participants believed Sacramento has a few benefits on its side: notably, strong collaboration between higher education institutions and strong regional planning by government, business and others that is addressing the growth in the region across many issues.

North State

The immediate area around Chico State and Butte Community College were cited as having a high college participation rate, but the overall rural northern part of the state was seen as underserved. Participants also noted that campuses in these regions can accommodate some enrollment from other parts of the state, but cited certain barriers that would need to be overcome: requirements for dorms, local constraints to campus growth, and whether students are able to leave their region to attend college.
South Bay — San Jose & Central Coast

In the South Bay, there is strong evidence that community organizations are contributing to improvements to the quality of K-12 education through school reform efforts. These successes are producing larger numbers of college-ready high school graduates — as well as mounting concerns that the current higher education system will not be able to accommodate them. Despite the recent recession, in the Silicon Valley where the high-tech industry is constantly evolving at a rapid rate, the demand for retraining continues to be a frontburner issue, for new and older workers alike. In addition, in Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Jose — as in other areas — the high cost of housing was cited as a significant part of the problem for students in the total cost of attending college.

San Diego County

In San Diego, participants expressed concern that the local population lacked training to fulfill the workforce demands of the biotech industry and other advanced professions that require additional skills and education. Many also cited concerns about the low funding of the local community colleges, as well as the serious crowding in regional universities. On a positive note, model education programs such as the Cal-PASS educational database and K-16 collaboratives were noted as efficient methods to improve students’ access and success in higher education in the region.

“The transfer process is so complex that it is increasingly more difficult for a community college student to be admitted to a university. Here in San Diego, we are being greatly affected since universities like San Diego State are impacted. Having a seamless transfer process is critical.”

BONNIE SCHMIEGE,
TRANSFER CENTER COORDINATOR,
GROSSMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
SAN DIEGO

Amrah Salomon Johnson, 27, San Francisco State University

Amrah had trouble getting classes first at community college and then when she transferred to San Francisco State University. Because she transferred to SF State as a Political Science and Creative Writing double-major, she thought she would have a wider course selection. However, this did not turn out to be the case. Amrah was obligated to enroll in two classes that would not count toward graduation to remain a full-time student in order to receive complete financial aid. She explains, “My classes are not only crowded, but physically uncomfortable. There are not enough seats, and many times I have no other option but to sit and take notes on the floor.”

For additional student stories, visit www.collegecampaign.org.
Part E

Recommendations

The College Opportunity Listening Tour reflects the willingness of Californians to engage in a serious conversation about the college-access crisis facing our state. The Listening Tour generated literally dozens of recommendations and proposed solutions to the crisis. The Campaign for College Opportunity analyzed these ideas, which informed our top five recommendations below.

The Campaign’s recommendations have not been endorsed by all the stakeholders we spoke with. That said, a number of our recommendations represent points of agreement among many tour participants. We propose these recommendations because we believe they are the most important steps we can take to address the problem.

1) **Develop a comprehensive College Opportunity Plan.** The State of California, with leadership from the Governor, state legislature, higher education and the K-12 system, must develop a plan to ensure continued access to community college and universities. The multi-year compact unveiled last year between Governor Schwarzenegger the UC and the CSU is a critical starting point. Population growth, workforce demands and enrollment projections indicate that we need to prepare for the long-term. The plan should include community colleges, CSU, UC, the independent colleges, K-12, and provisions for financial aid.

2) **Create greater efficiency.** Higher education leaders, at the campus level and across systems, should create and implement plans to promote greater efficiency that are likely to lead to greater student access and success. Opportunities include better college preparation for K-12 students; dual enrollment in high school and college; a better transfer process, and clearer paths for obtaining vocational and academic degrees in community colleges and universities. Partnerships with business and employers were also encouraged.

3) **Make funding for higher education a top priority.** The Governor and the Legislature should focus on meeting the needs of future college enrollment growth in part by developing a long-term financing plan based on projected state revenues. The goals should be to avoid restricting access, severe budget cuts, or drastic fee increases.

4) **Set a predictable fee policy.** The ideal policy would set a firm, predictable fee schedule to generate needed revenue to help solve the access crisis while keeping any increases moderate. This fee policy should be matched with additional financial aid.

5) **Provide better education on financial aid.** Equally important, the state needs to create a comprehensive marketing and public education campaign to inform more Californians about financial aid availability. The campaign should begin as early as middle school to assure students and their parents that college is within reach for every Californian who chooses to pursue it.
**Conclusion**

In today’s knowledge-based economy, California’s future prosperity and security will increasingly depend on the strength of an educated workforce. Every Californian who is motivated and prepared to attend college should have that opportunity. But that opportunity may be in jeopardy for hundreds of thousands of Californians unless we act now to address the problems in overcrowding, budget shortfalls, and growing demand that currently plague our community colleges and universities.

The tremendous surge in California’s college-age young people can and should be turned into an asset, not a liability for the state. As the College Opportunity Listening Tour revealed, there is enormous motivation and will among stakeholders statewide to tackle the problem, leveraging a combination of different possible solutions.

To maintain our stature as the fifth largest economy in the world, the Golden State must invest in a public higher education system capable of servicing future generations of college hopefuls. While the challenges ahead are significant, they are far from insurmountable. Identifying the problem and starting the dialogue on solutions today are important first steps toward our goal. Working together, we can ensure that our world-renowned colleges and universities are fully equipped to fulfill California’s promise.


Methodology

The College Opportunity Listening Tour

The Campaign for College Opportunity’s Listening Tour took place between November 2004 and March 2005. Over that period, the Campaign talked to a total of 1,612 stakeholders across California. Some meetings were one-on-one; others involved groups ranging from 10 individuals up to 100 people. Sixty-six briefings and events were organized or hosted by local organizations.

The stakeholders we spoke to represent a cross-section of the individuals and organizations with a vested interest in solving California’s higher education crisis. They included leaders in labor, business and K-12 education, college administrators and faculty as well as students and parents. We spoke with religious groups and community-based organizations including representatives of Latino, African-American, Asian-American and other ethnic communities. We also engaged elected officials and their staff and a number of reporters. Over 700 Tour participants also completed a questionnaire rating the three proposed solutions.

Regions where Listening Tours stops were held:

1. Central Valley (Bakersfield, Fresno, Modesto, Merced, Stockton, Sacramento)
2. Bay Area (San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Sonoma, Santa Clara counties)
3. Inland Empire (San Bernardino, Riverside)
4. Los Angeles (including San Fernando Valley, San Gabriel Valley, and Long Beach)
5. Northern California (Butte County)
6. Orange County
7. San Diego (including East County)
8. Central Coast (Santa Cruz, Monterey counties)

California Postsecondary Education Commission Data

For a full description of CPEC’s research methodology, please visit www.cpec.ca.gov for links to the following documents under CPEC reports. The methodology for the community college forecast, including the definition of regions, is described in CPEC’s new report titled “An Update on the Commission’s Community College Enrollment Demand Projections by Region.” A different methodology is used for the four year universities (CSU and UC). It is described in CPEC’s April 2003 report titled “A Regional Study of Undergraduate Enrollment Demand and Capacity for the University of California.”

CPEC’s methodology uses forecasts in population growth, demographic change, college participation rates, and state policy goals to develop enrollment forecasts by region and segment. These forecasts reflect the growing population of young adults and some increases in college participation rates consistent with historical trends.
About the Campaign for College Opportunity

The Campaign for College Opportunity is a nonprofit organization solely devoted to ensuring that the next generation of Californians has the chance to go to college as promised by the state’s 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. The co-founders of the Campaign are the California Business Roundtable, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund and the Community College League of California.

Resources

Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU). Represents 75 independent, accredited institutions of higher education in California. This report refers to data provided by AICCU. www.aiccu.edu.


California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. Provides data and programs to support California community colleges and college districts throughout the state. www.cccco.edu.

California Department of Education. Provides leadership, assistance, oversight and resources to California K-12 public schools, including programs in coordination with higher education. www.cde.ca.gov.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). Planning agency for higher education in California. This report refers to two CPEC publications on enrollment demand in California Community Colleges and the University of California, as well as other analysis conducted by CPEC staff. www.cpec.ca.gov.

California State University (CSU). Chancellor’s office supports and coordinates the 23 campus California State University system. www.calstate.edu.

Education Commission of the States. Provides state by state data on education from pre-school through higher education. This study cites data from “Closing the College Participation Gap: A National Summary” (October 2003) on the growth of the 18-24 year population nationally. www.ecs.org.


National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Provides analysis and programs for state and national higher education policymakers, including Measuring Up, a state-by-state study of higher education performance. www.highereducation.org.

University of California Office of the President (UCOP). Supports and coordinates the campuses, hospitals and labs of the University of California. www.ucop.edu.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Works with its 15 member states to assure access and excellence in higher education for all citizens of the West. This report refers to a 2003 study, “Knocking at the College Door: Projections of high school graduates by state, income and race/ethnicity.” www.wiche.edu.

Jonathan McCracken, 35, Los Angeles Mission College

Jonathan is one of many students suffering the consequences of class cancellations in community colleges following budget cuts. He was one class away from obtaining his paralegal certificate, when the class he needed was cut. Jonathan expresses, “I felt deprived from getting my paralegal certificate because I could not take the last class I needed to complete my degree.” Finally, a year later, the class was added to the class schedule. He is currently enrolled in the course, and will obtain his paralegal certificate in June. In addition to the shortage of classes, he fears many students are not attending college because they are not aware financial aid is available.

For additional student stories, visit www.collegecampaign.org.
Part H

Listening Tour Participants

Representatives of the following organizations participated in either an event or a small group meeting during the College Opportunity Listening Tour. Where boards or government agencies are listed, the listing refers to an individual from that agency participating. Inclusion on this list does not imply endorsement of the Campaign, this report, or any of the findings or recommendations in the report. We apologize for any omissions or errors in this listing.
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