Legislative Hearings Start

Legislators have begun conducting policy hearings to examine the impact of bills that were introduced earlier this year. These committee hearings provide an opportunity for community college advocates to weigh-in on the 100+ bills that will impact your students. League staff and our higher education partners will be working to ensure your voices are heard in Sacramento.

The majority of the bills tracked by the League will be heard by either the Senate Education Committee or the Assembly Higher Education Committee. A list and description of the key bills is below. For more information and sample letters please go to the League’s bill tracking website by clicking here.

**AB 19 (Santiago) Enrollment Fee Waiver**

Would utilize Proposition 98 resources to allow any student taking 12 or more units in their first academic year with eligibility for the Board of Governors Fee Waiver, regardless of financial need.

**AB 21 (Kalra) Access to Higher Education for Every Student**

Intended to protect AB 540 students, this bill prohibits California Community Colleges, the California State University and requests the University of California to the furthest extent legally possible to not cooperate with immigration enforcement agencies or officials. Specifically, it requires colleges to:

1) Refrain from releasing the immigration status of a college's students or staff to the extent allowed by federal law.
2) Require each faculty and staff member to notify college president if he or she suspects or becomes aware of federal immigration presence on campus.
3) Immediately notify all students if immigration officials are suspected of or planning to enter campus.
4) Assign a staff person who will be point of contact for those who are vulnerable to deportation.
5) Solicit and maintain a list of pro bono immigration legal services providers.
6) Designate a staff person to help those under the DACA program if it is canceled. Additionally, it states the intent of the legislature will be to fund the above provisions through an appropriation in the 2017-18 budget.

**AB 204 (Medina) Community colleges: Student Success and Support Program funding.**
Would require the Board of Governors (BOG) to, at least once every three years, review any due process standards adopted to appeal the loss of a BOG fee waiver. It would also require each community college district to, at least once every three years, examine the impact of the minimum academic and progress standards and determine whether those standards have had a disproportionate impact on a specific class of students. If a disproportionate effect is found, the bill would require the community college district to include steps to address that impact in a student equity plan. Additionally, it would require districts to permit students who lost their BOG FW to appeal on the basis of lack of proximity to other districts.

**AB 1435 (Gonzalez Fletcher) The Athlete Protection Act**
Would establish the Athlete Protection Commission would have the authority to regulate all collegiate athletic programs in the state. Funded by all colleges with an athletic program, it would be empowered to:
1) Set safety standards for student athlete injuries.
2) Require every college to set aside a specified amount of time for a student to study.
3) Intestate practices of athletic programs with poor graduation rates. AB 1651 (Reyes) Academic Employees: Paid Administrative Leave

**SB 769 (Hill) Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program**
This bill focuses on expanding access to baccalaureate degrees for students at community colleges. Specifically, it:
1) Eliminates the current present pilot program.
2) Adds an additional 15 community college districts who are able to participate in the program.
3) Lifts the one-program-per-district limit.
4) Narrows down the restrictions regarding duplicative degrees to only restricting a community college district's ability to offer a baccalaureate degree if it is duplicative of a program offered at a University of California or California State University within 100 miles of that district.

**Budget Update**
**ASSEMBLY & SENATE BUDGET HEARINGS**
Throughout March and April, the Assembly and Senate budget subcommittees will consider the Governor's budget proposal and evaluate its alignment to their respective fiscal priorities. While final actions are not expected until May, both houses have conveyed similar inquiries and questions:
- How does the Guided Pathways proposal differ from other student success programs?
• How do community colleges support students who are military veterans?
• What are colleges doing to increase enrollment?
• Why did the Administration set the Prop 98 split so that colleges receive 10.87% of funding, instead of the usual 10.93%?
• Only about 56% of community college instruction is delivered by full-time faculty. What can be done to increase this percentage?
• The Chancellor’s Office has approved 29 capital outlay projects which could receive Prop 51 funding. Why did the Administration limit the number of projects to five?

These questions provide insight into some of the priorities members will include in their final proposal. The Assembly and Senate have also indicated interest in college affordability, with the Assembly unveiling its Degrees Not Debt budget proposal last month. The Senate is also expected to release a proposal around addressing financial assistance to students. The League anticipates these proposals will seek to divert some community college apportionments funds toward a more expansive Proposition 98 financial aid program.

BUDGET TRAILER BILL SUMMARY
The Budget Trailer Bill Language is the implementing language of the California State Budget Bill. The 2017 Budget Trailer Bill was released on February 1. This year, the Trailer Bill includes policy implementation details and requirements for the Guided Pathways, the California Community Colleges Awards for Innovation, and technical cleanup to the Adult Education Block Grant. The League’s full Budget Trailer Bill summary is available here.

Guided Pathways – Trailer Bill Language:
The Trailer Bill adds Part 54.8 (commencing with §88920) to Division 7 of Title 3 of the Education Code, establishing the California Community College Guided Pathways Grant Program. The Guided Pathways program is intended to ensure integration of existing student success programs and services and to build capacity at colleges to develop clearly structured, coherent guided pathways programs. The programs would implement the $150 million one-time funding allocation in the Governor’s 2017-18 Budget.

Proposed Criteria for Grants:
Department of Finance gives the Chancellor’s Office authority over the requirements, programmatic criteria, and administrative guidelines colleges must meet in order to qualify for one-time grants. However, before the Chancellor’s Office may award funds, a college must demonstrate its commitment to implement a guided pathways framework by submitting a letter to the Chancellor’s Office signed by the following:

• President of the Governing Board of the community college district;
• CEO of the college; and
• President of the college’s academic senate.

Proposed Allocation of Funds:
The funding would be allocated to participating colleges as follows:
• Up to 10% to Chancellor's Office for administration and statewide support;
• 20% distributed equally among districts;
• 35% based on the percentage of FTES at each participating college; and
• 45% based on the percentage of students that would qualify for a Pell Grant, including AB 540 students at each participating college.

LAO Comments:
The LAO has recommended that the legislature seek clarification by specifically asking (1) how the proposed $150 million guided pathways program would be structured, implemented, and led; (2) what changes might be needed in how the state organizes and funds CCC student success efforts; and (3) the rationale for the proposed funding amount and timeline.

League Analysis:
As proposed, the language is fairly broad and provides authority to the Chancellor's Office to develop the program in a way that that he perceives to have the greatest systemic impact on colleges. This language is expected to change as budget negotiations move forward. However, the structure should present the opportunity for colleges with local support to implement the guided pathways framework to participate in the program without going through a competitive grant process. The League looks forward to working with member of the Senate and Assembly to support a guided pathways framework that best supports our students and colleges.

LEAGUE BUDGET PRIORITIES

Proposition 98 and General Operating Funds
The League is particularly grateful for the inclusion of a modest ($23 million) base augmentation to support general operations and educational quality at colleges. This type of augmentation dramatically improves academic quality and student success. According to the LAO, the 2017-18 minimum guarantee is expected to exceed the Administrations January estimates. This could result in nearly $100 million in ongoing revenue for community colleges. However, even if new revenue materializes, it is uncertain if the Administration would allocate it as ongoing funds. In its 2017-18 analysis, the LAO recommended that the Legislature consider a larger base increase if additional revenue is available in May. Should new resources become available at May Revise, including a base augmentation is the League's highest budget priority.

Capital Outlay
The League continues to seek clarification and details on the plan to release the $2 billion in Proposition 51 bond funding for CCC facility projects. The Governor proposed to fund five new capital outlay projects in the 2017-18 budget. The budget would provide $7.4 million for planning in FY 2017-18, and total funding for these projects would be $182
million. This is in contrast to the action of the Board of Governors, which approved 29 projects worth $692 million as part of its 2017-18 Capital Outlay Spending Plan. The Department of Finance has shown a willingness to consider funding additional projects, prioritizing projects with significant “health and safety” components. The League will reach out to colleges with unfunded projects and make the case to the Legislature about the importance of extending funding to all 29 projects in FY 2017-18.

**State Legislature Interest in Multiple Measures**

On March 1, the Senate Education Committee head an informational hearing focused on remedial education barriers and best practices. The committee made it clear that they are interested in expanding the use of multiple measures throughout the system.

Additionally, the Assembly has introduced a bill that would require the use of transcript data in order to place students in courses. The Basic Skills categorical was revised in the 2016-17 Budget Act and now colleges must adopt multiple measures in order to qualify for categorical funding. A full text of the bill can be viewed, by clicking [here](#).

**Background**

The Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) is a collaborative effort led by the RP Group and Educational Results Partnerships' Cal-PASS Plus system to develop, pilot, and assess implementation of a statewide placement tool using multiple measures. This project is an integrated effort of the California Community College’s Common Assessment Initiative (CAI).

For over two decades, California’s community colleges have been required to assess and place students in the curriculum through means other than a single test score. However, until recently, test scores have dominated the placement process across the California system. Yet, growing evidence indicates that multiple measures, such as high school transcripts and non-cognitive variables, can greatly improve the accuracy of the placement process, and in turn, can facilitate student movement into and through college-level coursework.

As part of the CAI, the Multiple Measures Assessment Project aims to contribute to the advancement of the approach across the state’s system. MMAP has three primary objectives:

1. Development of a data warehouse
2. Creation of a comprehensive analytical model
3. Development of user tools for assessment and placement using multiple measures

**Pilot Colleges**

MMAP is engaged with over 60 pilot colleges from across the state that are providing feedback on predictive models and user tools to help inform the adoption of the multiple measures approach.
A power point with more information can be found here.

Proposed United States Department of Education Cuts

On March 13th President Trump released his “skinny” budget proposal; named “skinny” because it outlines the proposed budget in broad strokes. More information regarding the specifics of his budget will be out later this Spring.

In order to fund a $54 billion increase in defense spending, the construction of a wall along the United States and Mexican border, and not cut Social Security or Medicare, President Trump has proposed significant budget cuts to the non-defense discretionary side of the budget. The Trump Administration is proposing to cut the Department of Education by 13%. Specific cuts to programs impacting higher education are below:

**Elimination of Pell Surplus** – While President Trump does not propose cutting the number or level of Pell Grant awards, he does propose spending the program’s current surplus on non-education expenses. This would result in no restoration of the summer nor would the awards continue to be tied to inflation.

**Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG)** – Eliminates the program, which provides $732 million in supplementary financial aid to low income students. California community college students are typically not eligible for this program to our already generous tuition policies.

**TRIO Programs** – Cuts $100 million from the program, which is about a 10% cut.

**GEAR UP** – Cuts $100 million from the program or about a 30% cut.

**Workforce and CTE Programs** – While the proposal does not specify programs or the levels of cuts, it does propose significant cuts to those programs.

For more information regarding President Trump’s budget proposal, click here. Department of Education details can be found on Page 17.
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