

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377777841>

A Unified Faculty Model: The Remedy for Decades of Failed Education "Reform" in the California Community Colleges

Preprint · March 2024

CITATIONS

0

READS

1,297

1 author:



Debra Klein

Gavilan College

23 PUBLICATIONS 28 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



**A Unified Faculty Model: The Remedy for Decades of Failed Education “Reform”
in the California Community Colleges**

Dr. Debbie Klein

Department of Social Science, Gavilan College

Abstract

The California Community Colleges (CCC) system plays a pivotal role as an engine for economic and social mobility in California and as a driver for the fifth largest economy in the world. In the past two decades, the CCC system has undergone significant “reform,” narrowing students’ educational opportunities and shrinking the student body by over one million students. During this period, the CCC system’s student outcomes have declined, stagnated, or only slightly improved despite decades of “reform” efforts. This paper illustrates that transitioning from a two-tiered to a nontiered—*unified faculty*—model will better serve students, colleges, and the state of California. The concept of a unified faculty emphasizes the elimination of the two employment tiers—part-and full-time faculty—to create a nontiered structure. This model is based on faculty and collegewide unity as opposed to the current structure that has produced a divided faculty, inequitable service to students, and stagnant or diminishing student outcomes. Presently, the K-12 system and Vancouver model are structured around a unified, nontiered faculty model. It is time for the California Community Colleges to address the hypocrisy at the heart of its institutions: decades of disinvestment from the faculty and thus, students. Investing in a nontiered, unified faculty model will remedy the CCC system that is currently struggling to bring back the millions of students who have been pushed out of their colleges.

Keywords: unified faculty model, California Community Colleges, nontiered model, student-faculty engagement, failed public education “reform”.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

A Unified Faculty Model: The Remedy for Decades of Failed Education “Reform” in the California Community Colleges¹

The California Community Colleges (CCC) system plays a pivotal role as an engine for economic and social mobility in California and as a driver for the fifth largest economy in the world. The system’s 116 colleges provide high-quality, accessible, and affordable higher education for the largest and most diverse student population in the United States. In the past two decades, the CCC system has undergone significant “reform,”² narrowing students’ educational opportunities and shrinking the student body by over one million students.³ During this period, the CCC system’s student outcomes have declined, stagnated, or only slightly improved despite decades of “reform” efforts.⁴ Furthermore, the system has not successfully met its transfer, employment, or equity goals over the past five years.⁵ After decades of narrowing the student experience, defunding instructional programs and curriculum, and deprofessionalizing the faculty, the CCC system “reform” has failed the California public.

It is time for the California Community Colleges to address the hypocrisy at the heart of its institutions: decades of disinvestment from the faculty and thus, students. Transitioning from

¹ I wish to acknowledge and thank John Govsky, Arnie Schoenberg, Dennis Smith, Jacob Traugott, and Ian Walton for providing valuable comments on multiple versions of this article. I also wish to thank the members of the FACCC Part-Time and Policy Committees for their feedback.

² “Reform” appears in quotations due to the fact that reform is often a misnomer when applied to higher education (Ravitch, 2020). Since the 1970s, neoliberal policies of deregulation, privatization, and defunding have not reformed but rather, have disrupted and disinvested from public education. (Isserles, 2021; MacLean, 2017; Mettler, 2014; Ravitch, 2020; Rein et al., 2021).

³ Since 2008, California’s population has increased by 2.5 million people. In this context, the CCC system’s student body should have increased. According to the system’s record of annual student headcount, the headcount for the system was 2,772,141 in the 2007-2008 academic year and 1,833,568 in the 2021-2022 academic year. See the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Data Mart.

⁴ Over the past two decades, the statewide retention rate has decreased by 3% for remedial courses, increased by 1% for credit courses, and increased by 1% for vocational courses. The statewide course-level success rate has decreased by 2% for remedial courses, increased by 0.5% for credit courses, and increased by 2% for vocational courses. The rate of degree and certificate completion by ethnicity fell significantly short of the Vision’s ten-year completion goal. For student outcomes data, see the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Data Mart. See Schlueter (2024) for a discussion of the need for student support to address the stagnation of success rates.

⁵ The Chancellor’s Office Vision for Success (2017-2022) set out to increase (by certain percentages) certificate and degree attainment, the number of transfer students, and the percent of career education students employed in their field. The Vision also aimed to close equity gaps by 40% within five years and 100% in ten years. The system did not meet its equity gap reduction goals for African American, Native American, Latinx, or Pacific Islander students, nor did it meet its transfer or career education student goals. While the system did meet its certificate and degree attainment goal, this metric is deceiving in the context of the system’s loss of over one million of its most vulnerable students. The majority of students who were able to persist and achieve degrees and certificates were the most college prepared and economically advantaged.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

a two-tiered to a nontiered—*unified faculty*—model will better serve the students, colleges, and state of California. The concept of a unified faculty emphasizes the elimination of the two employment tiers—part-and full-time faculty⁶—to create a nontiered structure. This model is based on faculty and collegewide unity as opposed to the current structure that has produced a divided faculty, inequitable service to students, and stagnant or diminishing student outcomes. Presently, the K-12 system and Vancouver Model are structured around a unified, nontiered faculty model. See Appendix A for a brief history of the two-tiered model and Appendix B for a discussion of the Vancouver model.

The over-reliance on an under-supported part-time faculty in the community colleges dates back to the 1970s during the era of neoliberal reform and the beginning of the corporatization of higher education in the United States. Research shows that the systemic over-reliance on part-time faculty correlates closely with declining rates of student success. Furthermore, when faculty are equitably compensated (as full-time faculty in the current model) and thus able to provide high-quality student-faculty engagement in and out of the classroom, students succeed at significantly higher rates (Astin, 1999; Burgess & Samuels, 2010; Ernst, 1997, 2002; Fain, 2014; Fichtenbaum, 2013; Fischer, 2005; Freeland, 1998; Gilbert, 2019; Heath et al., 2022; Jacoby, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Pilati, 2006; Terenzini et al., 1982; Tinto, 1987, 1989).

Over the past forty years, only 30% of the CCC faculty have been hired as full-time employees, while the remaining 70% have been hired as part-time employees who teach the majority of the system’s courses.⁷ Part-and full-time faculty have the same qualifications and teach the same courses and students. Nonetheless, part-time faculty do not have job security, often teach at several different colleges, and are not compensated equally for the same work as their full-time counterparts (Fure-Slocum & Goldstene, 2024; Gilbert, 2019; Hoeller, 2014). This inherently inequitable two-tiered structure was never meant to be permanent; has deprived

⁶ There has been much debate about the appropriate terminology for the category of faculty who teach off the tenure track. See Hoeller (2014) and Fure-Slocum and Goldstene (2024) for discussions of the problematic assumptions inherent in the terms part-time, adjunct, contingent, lecturer, and non-tenure track. This paper uses “part-time” to remain consistent with the terminology used by most of the faculty organizations and unions of the California Community Colleges.

⁷ For faculty headcount data, see the Chancellor’s Office Data Mart.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

students and colleges of having a fully supported faculty; and has mostly remained hidden from the public (Simpson, 2014).

In 1988, AB 1725 (Vasconcellos), the landmark community college bill, codified in California Education Code the goal to have 75% of its credit instruction taught by full-time faculty. Given its over-reliance on an under-supported part-time faculty, the system has never come close to achieving this goal. The fact that the state has established such a goal, however, signifies California's long-standing awareness of the problem and interest in addressing the inequities of the two-tiered model.

A unified faculty model will ensure that all faculty are paid on the same compensation scale, receive proportional benefits, and have the opportunity to earn job security. This model will enable and compensate all faculty to engage with their students in and out of the classroom and actively participate in the life of their college and community.

A unified faculty model will vastly improve student success rates and the efficiency of the California Community Colleges by: 1) prioritizing student-faculty engagement in and out of the classroom; 2) ensuring a culture of academic freedom; 3) increasing the amount of faculty who participate in college governance and institutional effectiveness processes; 4) fulfilling the system's civic engagement mission to prepare the residents of California to participate in the state's democratic processes; and 5) increasing college and systemwide fiscal stability.

A Unified Faculty Will Revitalize California's Community Colleges

For millions of Californians, community colleges remain the only pathway toward economic survival, skills building and retraining, transfer to four-year institutions, English learning, connection with community, participation in democracy, and the formation and pursuit of dreams. The "reform" era has chipped away at the mission of the California Community Colleges without giving the public a chance to deliberate over the repurposing of its colleges. Remedial instruction, English as a second language programs, and lifelong learning courses have been cut or severely reduced without public debate.

A unified faculty will revitalize the quality and purpose of a community college education by providing equitable student access to all faculty, a culture of academic freedom, and a renewed commitment to civic engagement. A unified faculty will take collective responsibility for participating in the system's governance at college and statewide levels.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

Finally, this model will promote fiscal stability by streamlining processes around hiring, evaluation, and budget planning.

High-quality, ongoing student-faculty engagement in and out of the classroom is the key ingredient for student success in college and beyond (Astin, 1999; Burgess & Samuels, 2010; Fain, 2014; Gilbert, 2019; Heath et al., 2022; Jacoby, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Terenzini et al., 1982; Tinto, 1987).⁸

The overwhelming evidence indicates that a diverse, often underprepared, and economically challenged student population requires personal mentoring, counseling, and ongoing guidance in support of courses of study and personal aspirations. Persistent informal and collegial interactions with faculty provide students with necessary levels of support and personal mentoring. In addition to intellectual engagement with the subject matter both in and outside the classroom, such interactions—from formal sponsorships of student organizations and letters of recommendation to casual and spontaneous conversations—introduce an inspirational support structure into the lives of students during a transformative phase in their lives...[S]uch student/faculty interactions enrich educators’ understanding and appreciation of their students, and by extension, heighten faculty involvement within their institutions and profession, thus contributing to an inclusive and interactive college culture for everyone—students, faculty, and staff. (Gilbert, 2019, p. iii)

A unified faculty model prioritizes student-faculty engagement, reducing disparities in student access to academic support, office hours, mentorship opportunities, supplemental instruction, independent studies, fieldwork, and engaged civic and community learning. A unified faculty will be able to participate in activities that are critical for student persistence and goal completion, including student orientations, student governance, student clubs, research teams, joint conference presentations, campus receptions and celebrations, and community events.

California’s community colleges play an essential role preparing the residents of California to become active participants in the state’s democratic processes at all levels—community engagement, civic engagement, and leadership development in the workplace, communities, and local and state governance. Colleges’ commitment to civic engagement is one of the core tenets for democracy to function (Colby et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 2000; Sullivan & Transue, 1999). When all faculty work together to fulfill their college’s civic engagement

⁸ For a thorough review of the literature about the close correlation of student-faculty engagement with student success, see *Why Faculty Matter: The Role of Faculty in the Success of Community College Students* (p. 26-49).

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

mission, students will have equitable access to opportunities to apply their knowledge, skills, and life experience to hands-on (paid and course credit) work within their communities.

In today's political climate, the CCC system must actively protect its core value of academic freedom so that students and faculty are free to express and explore ideas without risk of interference or punishment. A unified faculty model will ensure that academic freedom remains a cornerstone of students' educational experience. Under the current model, part-time faculty do not have job security protecting them from administrative interference. A unified faculty will be empowered to explore diverse perspectives, challenging students to think critically and engage in thoughtful discourse. Academic freedom enables students to be exposed to a wide range of ideas, beliefs, and cultures, creating a rich, inclusive, and democratic learning environment.

Faculty leadership is necessary to ensure the CCC system's high-quality education and future growth. California's community colleges rely on faculty leadership and participation for their governance, strategic planning, and assessment at student, curricular, program, and institutional levels. Since the signing of AB 1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988) into law, the CCC system has become "perhaps the most inclusive system of governance enjoyed by any system of higher education in the world" (Morse, 2017, p. 5). A unified faculty will share responsibility for their college's governance and institutional effectiveness, fostering an inclusive and collaborative culture that will benefit all students.

...[F]ull-time tenured faculty dedicate increasing hours to the institutional needs of the college, such as serving on governance committees, preparing program review reports, writing and updating curriculum, compiling accreditation documentation, participating on hiring committees, observing and assessing classes..., and reviewing tenure candidates, all in conjunction with their need to maintain currency in both pedagogical approaches and subject matter content. While all of these requirements constitute important and essential work, on most community college campuses, there are simply not enough full-time tenured faculty to address so many needs, and thus, faculty interaction time with students suffers. (Gilbert, 2019, p. iii)

A unified faculty is increasingly necessary to provide institutional memory, governance, assessment work, and leadership in addition to their vital work with students. While college administrators and trustees frequently come and go, the faculty and staff form the heart of every college.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

Since 2020, the global pandemic and its ongoing effects have severely impacted the lives of the students and employees of the CCC system. “[T]he effects of illness, economic turmoil, and institutional restructuring widened existing inequities along racial, class, and gender lines on campuses, in communities, and globally, compounding longer-standing trends that the Great Recession already had accelerated” (Fure-Slocum & Goldstene, 2024, p. 12). The majority of California’s community college students are part-time (74%), students of color (70%), economically disadvantaged (66%), and working learners (64%) while many of its students are first-generation (35%) and noncitizens (14%).⁹ In a recent statewide survey asking previously enrolled students why they dropped classes, they said they had to prioritize work (33%) and their mental health (30%); could not keep up with the pace of classes (29%); needed to care for dependents (23%); could not afford course materials (19%); and could not learn in an online environment (19%).¹⁰ The majority of CCC students are working and caring for family while pursuing their college education.¹¹

Now more than ever, an equitably compensated, unified faculty is needed to spend more time engaging with students in and out of the classroom, offering students the support they need to succeed in their courses and beyond. During this era of existential social, economic, and environmental crises, a unified faculty is the key to bringing back California’s community college students and revitalizing the nation’s largest system of higher education.

A Unified Faculty Will Remedy Decades of Failed Education “Reform”

Community college education is a transformative process that nurtures critical thinking, creativity, empathy, civic engagement, personal growth, and a desire for lifelong learning, equipping students with the skills and mindset necessary to navigate the complex and rapidly changing world. Not only do CCC students gain the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed as individuals; they become inspired to contribute to the progress and prosperity of their larger communities.

[W]hen the United States was founded, public officials promoted higher education because it mattered for the broader public. They strongly believed that

⁹ For student demographic data, see California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. (2023). *Senate Budget Committee 1 On Education Finance*.

¹⁰ For an analysis of statewide college attendance, see California Community Colleges in Partnership with the RP Group. (2022). *Statewide College Attendance Survey*.

¹¹ For a discussion of the meaning of a college education from the perspective of community college students, see Isserles’ Chapter 5 (2021) based on interviews with students and her extensive classroom experience.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

by encouraging and subsidizing advanced learning, the nation would foster the knowledge, creativity, dynamism, leadership, and skills that would spur economic growth, technological innovation, and social advances. (Mettler, 2014, p. 191)

Because education matters for the broader public now more than ever, it is time for California to embrace a new approach to ensure all Californians have access to higher education—for themselves and the survival of our communities during these precarious times.

Imagine how a unified faculty will transform college campuses into equitable and efficient teaching and learning environments in service to the students, community colleges, and state of California. Investing in a nontiered, unified faculty model will remedy the CCC system that is currently struggling to bring back the millions of students who have been pushed out of their colleges. Prioritizing the faculty's vital role in students' lives, California will set a precedent for a truly inclusive and equitable educational system that will empower millions of students to positively impact the economy and democracy of California, the nation, and the world.

References

- Astin, A.W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Students Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Berry, J. & Worthen, H. (2021). *Power despite precarity: Strategies for the contingent faculty movement in higher education*. London: Pluto Press.
- Burgess, L. A. & Samuels. C. (2010). Impact of full-time versus part-time instructor status on college student retention and academic performance in sequential courses. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23(5), 487-498.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/106689299264684>
- California Community Colleges & the RP Group. (2022). *Statewide college attendance survey*. California Community Colleges & the RP Group.
https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/StatewideCaliforniaCommunityCollegeSurveys/Statewide_College_Attendance_Survey_Fall2022_February2023.pdf
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2023). *2022-2023 state of the system report: Equity for every student*. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.
<https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/2022-23-State-of-the-System-Report.pdf>
- Chavez, Cesar. (n.d.). *Education of the heart: Cesar Chavez in his own words*. United Farm Workers. <https://ufw.org/research/history/education-heart-cesar-chavez-words/>
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E. & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. Wiley.
- Colby, G. (2023). Data snapshot: Tenure and contingency in US higher education. *AAUP*, March 2023, 1-7. <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/AAUP%20Data%20Snapshot.pdf>
- Cosco, F. (2019). The Vancouver model of equality for college faculty employment. In K. Hoeller (Ed.), *Equality for contingent faculty: Overcoming the two-tier system* (pp. 200-225). Vanderbilt University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1675b5d>
- Cosco, F. (2024). *VCCFA: One tier & how it spread in BC* [Webinar]. California Federation of Teachers Community College Council.
https://contingentworld.com/onefaculty/cosco_240315.php
- Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ernst, B. (1997). Some implications of tenure for the profession and society. *Perspectives*, 16.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

- Ernst, B. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review*, 5(1).
- Fain, P. (2014). Low expectations, high stakes. *Inside Higher Ed*.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/07/part-time-professors-teach-most-community-college-students-report-finds>
- Fichtenbaum, R. (2013). From the president: Why is US higher education in decline? *AAUP*.
<https://www.aaup.org/article/president-why-us-higher-education-decline>
- Fischer, K. (2005). Growing use of adjunct professors may mean poorer education for students, says conference speaker. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
<https://www.chronicle.com/article/growing-use-of-adjunct-professors-may-mean-poorer-education-for-students-says-conference-speaker/>
- Freeland, R.S. (1998). Adjunct faculty in the community college. US Department of Education.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED424899.pdf>
- Fure-Slocum, E. & Goldstene, C. (Eds.). (2024). *Contingent faculty and the remaking of higher education: A labor history*. University of Illinois Press.
- Gilbert, G. (2019). *Why faculty matter: The role of faculty in the success of community college students*. Faculty Association of California Community Colleges Education Institute.
<https://www.faccc.org/assets/docs/PolicyPapers/Faculty%20Research%20Paper.pdf>
- Heath, S., Darr, C. & Acharya, L. (2022). Banking on the future: Student academic performance, retention, graduation, and instructor type.” *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 22(4), 1-13.
- Hoeller, K. (Ed.). (2014). *Equality for contingent faculty: Overcoming the two-tier system*. Vanderbilt University Press.
- Hoeller, K. (2014). The academic labor system of faculty apartheid. In K. Hoeller (Ed.), *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System* (pp. 116-155). Vanderbilt University Press.
- Isserles, R. (2021). *The costs of completion: Student success in community college*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduate rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 77(6), 1081-1103.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

- Kahne, J. & Sporte, S. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic engagement learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 738-766.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/0002831208316951>
- Klein, D. (2020). Making progress toward part-time faculty equity. *FACCCCTS*, Spring 2020, 6-9.
<https://www.faccc.org/assets/docs/FACCCCTS/Spring2020Articles/Making%20Progress%20Toward%20Part-Time%20Faculty%20Equity.pdf>
- Klein, D. (Forthcoming). How the austerity agenda disappeared over a million California Community College students: A faculty perspective." *Teachers College Record Special Issue on Community Colleges*. Columbia University Press.
- MacLean, N. (2017). *Democracy in chains: The deep history of the radical right's stealth plan for America*. Viking.
- Mettler, S. (2014). *Degrees of inequality: How the politics of higher education sabotaged the American dream*. Basic Books.
- Morse, D. (2017). The history of the ASCCC project: A partial history of the passage of AB 1725. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, September 2017, 1-5.
<https://www.asccc.org/content/history-asccc-project-partial-history-passage-ab-1725>.
- Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout Decisions from a theoretical model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60-75.
- Patton J. (2011). "Faculty participation on the Student Success Task Force 2011." *Rostrum*, November 2011. <https://www.asccc.org/content/faculty-participation-student-success-task-force-2011>.
- Pilati, M. (2006). Why full-time faculty matter. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. <https://www.asccc.org/content/why-full-time-faculty-matter>
- Ravitch, D. (2014). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. Vintage Press.
- Ravitch, D. (2020). *Slaying Goliath: The passionate resistance to privatization and the fight to save America's public schools*. Penguin Random House LLC.
- Rein, M. & Ellinger, M. & Legion, V. (2021). *Free City! The fight for San Francisco's City College and education for all*. PM Press.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

- Schlueter, J. (2024). The (de)acceleration of college: The focus of student success initiatives should be support, not acceleration. *EdSource*, March 4.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/views/2024/03/04/deacceleration-college-opinion>
- Simpson, L. (2014). The new abolition movement. In K. Hoeller (Ed.), *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System* (pp. 191-199). Vanderbilt University Press.
- Sullivan, J. L., & Transue, J. E. (1999). The psychological underpinnings of democracy: A selective review of research on political tolerance, interpersonal trust, and social capital. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 625-650.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.625>
- Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T. & Lorang, W.G. (1982). An assessment of the academic and social influences on freshman year educational outcomes. *Review of Higher Education*, 5, 86-110.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures for student attrition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1989). Misconceptions mar campus discussions of student retention. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36(1). <https://www.chronicle.com/article/misconceptions-mar-campus-discussions-of-student-retention/>
- Vancouver Community College. (2022). Summary of survey results: 2018 to 2022. *Diploma, Associate Degree, and Certificate Student Outcomes Survey*. Vancouver: Vancouver Community College. <https://www.vcc.ca/media/vancouver-community-college/content-assets/documents/institutional-research/VCC-Overall-2018-2022.pdf>

Appendix A

The Two-Tiered Model: A Brief History

The over-reliance on part-time faculty in the community colleges dates back to the 1970s during the era of neoliberal reform and beginning of the corporatization of higher education in the United States (Ravitch, 2020). Since federal and state administrations began to cut funding for public education, colleges have over-relied on an under-supported part-time faculty workforce. Significantly, the systemic over-reliance on part-time faculty correlates closely with declining rates of student success (Gilbert, 2019).

Students experience challenges with persistence, retention, graduation, and overall academic success in colleges and universities, particularly when courses are taught by adjunct instructors. Using a sample of 21,274 student results in three different general education disciplines from 2010 to 2019, the authors found that there was a disparity between adjunct and full-time faculty members in those key outcomes. (Heath et al., 2022, p. 1)

In 1969, part-time faculty represented 19% of the higher education faculty in the nation. From 1975 to 2011, the number of part-time faculty grew by more than 300%. Presently, around 76% of faculty positions nationwide are part-time and not on the tenure track (Colby, 2023; Gilbert, 2019). In the CCC system, around 70% of the faculty have been hired as part-time faculty for over four decades.

In 1988, AB 1725 (Vasconcellos), the landmark community college bill, was signed into law, ushering in a new era for the California Community Colleges. This comprehensive bill intended to increase the role and status of the CCC system, shifting the community colleges away from their roots in the K-12 system toward an alignment with the other segments of higher education. AB 1725 codified in California Education Code the goal to have 75% of its credit instruction taught by full-time faculty. Having never achieved this goal, the system's percentage of credit instruction taught by full-time faculty has hovered around 56% for the past four decades. However, adding noncredit instruction¹² into the equation, the percentage of instruction taught by full-time faculty has been significantly lower.¹³ During the recession of the early

¹² The California Community Colleges mission to provide remedial education was surreptitiously removed in state budget trailer bill language in December 2022. Thus, noncredit instruction increased when most of the system's remedial courses shifted from credit to noncredit departments.

¹³ See the faculty and staff demographics and courses reports of the Chancellor's Office Data Mart.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

1990s, funding for additional full-time faculty positions was cut and never restored (Gilbert, 2019, p. iv).

Due to the organizing efforts of the three faculty unions (CFT, CTA, and CCCI) as well as the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) in the late 1990s and early 2000s, categorical¹⁴ funding for part-time faculty office hours, benefits, and pay parity—equal pay for equal work—was included in a few yearly state budgets. A few state budgets also included some funding designated for full-time faculty positions. Over the past four decades, the strategy of slightly improving conditions for part-time faculty and intermittently adding some full-time positions has not addressed the chronic and systemic inequity of the two-tiered model.

During the Great Recession, a new era with a focus on “student success”¹⁵ changed the course of the CCC system. The Student Success Act of 2012 created policies to streamline the student experience and shrink the CCC system in the name of efficiency. This legislation excluded faculty from its vision largely because faculty were considered too expensive to fund (Gilbert, 2019; Patton, 2011). During this era, faculty organizations have been actively engaging each other, their colleges, the statewide Chancellor's Office, and state legislators in sincere dialogue about why faculty are central to student, institutional, and societal success.

¹⁴ Categorical funding is not part of the general fund and must be reappropriated by the state every fiscal year. As a result of this process, categorical funding is unreliable and often short-term.

¹⁵ Foundation, government, and think tank circles create and circulate the same narratives within their elite echo chamber. When they began to fund the “reform” of the CCC system, their claims that the system was not sufficiently focused on “student success” were not based on peer-reviewed research. But because of their power and the rippling effects of their echoes, the public uncritically consumed their false narrative that American education was failing (Ravitch, 2020, p. 76). This is also known as the “Gates Effect” (Rein et al., 2021, p. 201).

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

Appendix B

The Vancouver Model

An example of a well-established unified faculty structure is the Vancouver model. During the 1980s, Vancouver Community College (VCC) invested in the restructuring of its faculty by creating a nontiered faculty model. An urban community college, VCC is located in the city of Vancouver. Serving over 15,000 students in 2023, VCC employs around 750 faculty.¹⁶ According to VCC's recent student outcomes survey, 94% of the respondents found employment in their field after graduation, and 94% said they were satisfied with the education they received (Vancouver Community College, 2022). For over three decades, this model has successfully served the VCC students, city of Vancouver, and Canada.

By the early 1990s, all VCC faculty were granted pro-rata pay equity (equal pay for equal work) and the right to automatic “regularization”—job security—after 380 days of half-time or more work over any two-year period. Since the 1990s, the Vancouver Community College Faculty Association (VCCFA) has negotiated various improvements to this base, including equitable health and sick leave benefits, retirement, seniority, professional development funds, academic freedom, and more (Cosco, 2019).

In the Vancouver model, the part-time or full-time distinction is not the crucial one. Nor is rank the crucial distinction—there is only one rank, instructor, and all instructors are on the same eleven-step salary scale. Pay equity is absolute: 30 percent and 60 percent instructors respectively make exactly 30 percent and 60 percent of a full-time salary at the same salary step over the same period of time. The most important distinction between instructors is between term and regular status; that is, between probationary, time-limited employment and nonprobationary, continuing employment. (Cosco, 2019, p. 200)

In this model, faculty are categorized as regular (half-time or more), term (specified periods with starting and ending dates), or auxiliary (unspecified periods that do not exceed 19 days). Faculty seniority is updated on a yearly basis. For the last two decades, around 75% of the faculty have been hired as regularized faculty, while around 25% have been hired as term or auxiliary faculty (Cosco, 2024).

¹⁶ See Vancouver Community College website.

A UNIFIED FACULTY MODEL

Taking inspiration from the Vancouver model, many of the California Community Colleges' system partners and stakeholders¹⁷ have been preparing to launch a systemwide transition to a unified faculty model. While the creation and adoption of legislation could also support this transition, legislation is not necessary for a transition to begin at the college level. Individual colleges, for example, could pilot a unified faculty model to demonstrate its efficacy. A statewide transition to a unified faculty model will require leadership and coalition building among the statewide faculty unions, academic senate, Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office, and other stakeholder groups.

¹⁷ The Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) and the California Federation of Teachers (CFT) have been leading the effort and garnering support to make the transition to a unified faculty model.