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The California “Master” Plan
In the 1950s, the state's legislators and academic administrators foresaw an approaching surge in University enrollment, due to the baby boom children coming of age. They needed a plan to be able to maintain educational quality in the face of growing demand. The underlying principles that they sought were:

That some form of higher education ought to be available to all regardless of their economic means, and that academic progress should be limited only by individual proficiency; and

differentiation of function so that each of the three systems would strive for excellence in different areas, so as to not waste public resources on duplicate efforts.

Clark Kerr stated that the goal of the master plan was to balance the "competing demands of fostering excellence and guaranteeing educational access for all."
“Master” Plan (cont)

- UC is designated the State's primary academic research institution and is to provide undergraduate, graduate and professional education. UC was to select from among the top (12.5%) of the high school graduating class.

- CSU's primary mission is undergraduate education and graduate education through the master's degree including professional and teacher education. Faculty research is authorized consistent with the primary function of instruction. SB 724 (2006) authorized CSU to award a specific Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in educational leadership. CSU was to select from among the top (33.3%) of the high school graduating class.

- The California Community Colleges have as their primary mission providing academic and vocational instruction for older and younger students through the first two years of undergraduate education (lower division). In addition, the Community Colleges are authorized to provide remedial instruction, English as a Second Language courses, adult noncredit instruction, community service courses, and workforce training services. Open access
The Real Plan

“While the mythic stature of the Master Plan is well-deserved in many respects, the reality of its creation was much less bold and idealistic. According to the literature surrounding it, the Master Plan was a defensive response to a set of challenges that threatened to upend California higher education. Rather than establishing truly universal access to higher education, it sought to provide—and limit—college and university education to those with the “capacity and willingness to profit by college instruction.” According to Clark Kerr, a leading figure in its development, the Master Plan was “a desperate attempt to prepare for a tidal wave of students, to escape state legislative domination, and to contain escalating warfare among its separate segments.”

The Master Plan for Higher Education in California and State Workforce Needs Report: December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>State Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$17,182</td>
<td>$6,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$32,381</td>
<td>$11,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>$7,749</td>
<td>$5,821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• California’s community colleges and CSU serve student populations that more or less match the racial breakdown of high school graduates in the state.

• African American students are disproportionately overrepresented in the California Community College and the Private for Profit College.

• In the UC system, Asians are overrepresented, while African American and Latino students are underrepresented.

• Low income students are more likely to start at community colleges. The state’s lowest-income students come from families making less than $30,000 a year. About half of the students at California’s community colleges, private for-profit four-year institutions, and private two-year institutions are from California’s lowest-income families, compared to about one in four at CSU and UC and one in seven at private nonprofit four-year schools. PPIC.ORG/HIGHER-EDUCATION
More students are ready for college...The proportion of high school graduates who meet this requirement is increasing rapidly: from 34 percent of public high school graduates in 2003–04 to 42 percent in 2013–14. Gains have been especially strong for Latino high school graduates, with the share completing the UC and CSU required preparatory coursework increasing from 22 percent in 2003–04 to 32 percent in 2013–14. . . . but the enrollment framework at UC and CSU has not expanded. Even though more students are meeting entrance requirements, CSU and UC have admitted about the same proportion of students as in the past, leaving an increasing number of qualified applicants without access. In the past three years, more than 30,000 qualified freshmen applicants were redirected to UC Merced (fewer than 600 of those students registered). In the California State University system, 17 of the 23 campuses are unable to accept all qualified applicants to the majors to which they apply. In 2013–14, CSU campuses rejected more than 14,000 qualified freshmen applicants.
Can you get a structure to do something counter to what it was designed to do?
Reform does not Work & It Never has and it Never will
We Have to Create A New Plan
A Community College Revolution
Revolutionary Change Model

• Inequity informed Equity work
• Fix the College not the Student
• Expose and Challenge Racist Structures
• Exploit Structural Weakness
• Interrogate ALL Practices & Policies
• Kill the Pilot
• Sustained sense of urgency
• Operate out of Courage and not the fear of.......
1st Term 15 Unit Enrollment Rate
By Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st Term English Enrollment Rate

Fall 2015: 34.3%
Fall 2016: 44.8%
Fall 2017: 47.1%
Fall 2018: 47.9%
Fall 2019: 49.7%
1st Term English Enrollment Rate By Race/Ethnicity

- African American
  - Fall 2015: 24.2%
  - Fall 2019: 40.2%
- Asian/Pacific Islander
  - Fall 2015: 36.7%
  - Fall 2019: 52.3%
- Hispanic/Latino
  - Fall 2015: 36.4%
  - Fall 2019: 50.1%
- White
  - Fall 2015: 33.8%
  - Fall 2019: 48.4%
- Native American
  - Fall 2015: 50.0%
  - Fall 2019: 20.0%
- Other/Unknown
  - Fall 2015: 34.0%
  - Fall 2019: 31.4%
$1^{st}$ Year Transfer-Level English Completion Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st Year Transfer-Level English Completion Rate By Race/Ethnicity

- African American: 10.4% (2015-2016) vs. 29.9% (2018-2019)
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 25.1% (2015-2016) vs. 46.1% (2018-2019)
- Hispanic/Latino: 21.6% (2015-2016) vs. 41.5% (2018-2019)
- White: 26.9% (2015-2016) vs. 39.9% (2018-2019)
- Native American: 0.0% (2015-2016) vs. 40.0% (2018-2019)
- Other/Unknown: 24.1% (2015-2016) vs. 40.2% (2018-2019)

Legend: 
- Blue = 2015-2016
- Orange = 2018-2019
1st Term Math Enrollment Rate

- Fall 2015: 37.7%
- Fall 2016: 42.8%
- Fall 2017: 48.2%
- Fall 2018: 51.9%
- Fall 2019: 44.9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st Year Transfer-Level Math Completion Rate

- 2015-2016: 9.0%
- 2016-2017: 9.1%
- 2017-2018: 9.7%
- 2018-2019: 16.4%
1st Year Transfer-Level Math Completion Rate By Race/Ethnicity

African American: 0.7% 2015-2016, 9.9% 2018-2019
Asian/Pacific Islander: 18.0% 2015-2016, 23.7% 2018-2019
Hispanic/Latino: 4.4% 2015-2016, 13.6% 2018-2019
White: 9.2% 2015-2016, 14.8% 2018-2019
Native American: 0.0% 2015-2016, 10.0% 2018-2019
Other/Unknown: 9.4% 2015-2016, 13.6% 2018-2019
1st Year Transfer-Level Math and English Completion Rate

- 2015-2016: 5.0%
- 2018-2019: 6.2%
- 2015-2016: 7.5%
- 2018-2019: 13.6%
1st Year Transfer-Level Math & English Completion Rate By Race/Ethnicity

- African American: 0.3% (2015-2016), 8.0% (2018-2019)
- Hispanic/Latino: 2.5% (2015-2016), 11.8% (2018-2019)
- Native American: 0.0% (2015-2016), 10.0% (2018-2019)
- Other/Unknown: 5.2% (2015-2016), 10.7% (2018-2019)