Two High Stakes Propositions on the Ballot

It is a record-setting year for citizen-initiatives. Californians will have a crowded ballot in November 2016 as a result of a low voter turnout in 2014 which set the lowest initiative signature requirements the state has seen since 1982. According to the Los Angeles Times, between funding signature gathering efforts and campaigning, more than $452 million will be spent directly on ballot measures in California in 2016.

Voters will decide on a total of 17 ballot initiatives this November, the most for an election since 2000. For community colleges, two important initiatives are at stake, Proposition 51 and Proposition 55. Proposition 51 is a K-14 facilities bond. Proposition 55 is the temporary extension of tax generated resources for schools and community colleges. We want you to have the information and facts about these initiatives so that your stakeholders can make informed decisions and know how to support community colleges.

Proposition 51 - California Public Education Facilities Bond Initiative
The Kindergarten through Community College Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2016, known as Proposition 51, would provide $2 billion to community colleges for construction of new classrooms to accommodate enrollment growth, repair of health and safety issues, equipping classrooms with essential technology, and renovation of facilities.

Some key factor proponents of both Proposition 51 and Proposition 55 is how they interact with each other on a crowded ballot. According to the April 2016 poll, “Californian’s and Education,” by the Public Policy Institute of California:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposition 30 Extension</th>
<th>Statewide School Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Voter Support*</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition 55 - California Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare Initiative:
The “Children’s Education and Health Care Protection Act of 2016”, or Proposition 55, would extent the current personal income rates which were established by Proposition 30 in 2012. The coalition has released a new
website, www.protectingcalifornia.com, where supporters and voters can find more information about the measure.

The California Children’s Education and Health Care Protection Act of 2016 would temporarily extend for 12 years current tax rates on the wealthiest 2% of Californians, defined as singles earning more than $250,000 and couples earning more than $500,000 a year. The quarter-cent sales tax increase that was part of Proposition 30 expires as planned at the end of the year. The initiative would generate $8-11 billion per year. California Community colleges receive about $200 million annually from the Education Protection Account.

- Revenues would continue to be deposited into the Education Protection Account, a dedicated fund where monies go directly to public schools and community colleges.
- Revenues would also be used to improve access to health care for low-income children and their families.
- Funding state reserves would be the next priority.
- Health care for the poor would receive 50 percent of the remaining money, with the rest going to the General Fund.

A yes vote on this measure means: Income tax increases on high-income taxpayers, which are scheduled to end after 2018, would instead be extended through 2030. A no vote on this measure means: Income tax increases on high-income taxpayers would expire as scheduled at the end of 2018.

For supporters of specific ballot initiatives, such as a Proposition 51 or 55, active support and messaging will be important. Nonprofit organizations, such as the League, are allowed to advocate for ballot initiatives under the organizations lobbying rules.

Earlier this month, the Community College League of California, in partnership with the Community College Public Relations Officer (CCPRO), hosted an informational webinar about the November 2016 ballot initiatives that matter most to community colleges. A copy of that webinar and sample board resolutions can be found here.

**Fate of Many Bills Determined in Appropriations**

The month of August is always a busy time in the state capitol. Lawmakers have returned to Sacramento to close out the 2015-16 legislative session. Legislators have until the end of August to pass legislation on a wide variety of topics ranging from prison reforms, affordable housing to gun control and many others. On August 11, the Senate and Assembly Appropriations Committees took actions on the Suspense Files (the list of bills with cost pressures above a certain threshold). The League monitored 29 bills on the Assembly and Senate Appropriations Suspense Files. Of those, a total of 19 have passed. Bills that passed out of Appropriations committees will go to the floor while bills that were held are considered dead for the legislative session.

We continue to monitor a total of 27 bills on the Assembly or Senate Floor and will working with authors of the following priority bills: AB 1397 (Ting), AB 1690 (Medina), AB 2155 (Ridley-Thomas), AB 2364 (Holden), and SB 1359 (Block). Below is a brief summary of actions taken on key pieces of legislation. For a comprehensive list, including outcomes and amendments taken, click here.
AB 1690 (Medina) – Community Colleges: Part-Time, Temporary Employees
League Position: Oppose
Location: Senate Floor

This bill would mandate that all colleges give seniority re-hire rights to their part-time faculty pool.

AB 1721 (Medina) – Student Financial Aid: Cal Grant Program
League Position: Sponsor
Location: Held in Senate Appropriations

This bill would increase the number of competitive Cal Grant awards to 34,000.

AB 1741 (Rodriguez) – California College Promise Innovation Grant Program
League Position: Support
Location: Senate Floor

This bill would implement the College Promise Innovation Grant Program for which $15 million was allocated in the 2016-17 budget.

AB 1837 (Low) – Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability
League Position: Support if Amended
Location: Held in Senate Appropriations

This bill would establish a statewide coordinating entity, similar to the California Postsecondary Education Commission but does not specify that this body shall include segmental representation.

AB 1985 (Williams) – Postsecondary education
League Position: Watch
Location: Senate Floor

This bill would require the California Community Colleges to develop, and each community college district to adopt, a uniform policy to award a pupil who passes an Advanced Placement exam with a score of 3 or higher credit for a course within this curriculum with subject matter similar to that of the Advanced Placement exam.

AB 1995 (Williams) – Community colleges: homeless students: shower facilities
League Position: Watch
Location: Senate Floor

This bill would require community colleges that have shower facilities to grant access to those facilities for all enrolled students, including those who are homeless.

AB 2017 (McCarty) – College Mental Health Services Program
League Position: Support
Location: Senate Floor

The bill would appropriate $40 million from Proposition 63 funds to create a competitive grant program to fund mental health services at public colleges.

AB 2636 (Holden) – Community colleges: exemption from nonresident tuition
League Position: Support
Location: Senate Floor
This bill would exempt a student, other than a nonimmigrant alien from paying nonresident tuition at the California State University and the California Community Colleges if that student is currently a California high school student enrolled in a concurrent enrollment or dual enrollment program. The bill would allow these students to be reported by a community college district as a full-time equivalent student for apportionment purposes.

**AB 2738 (Olsen) – School bonds: local school bonds: investment**
League Position: **Oppose**
Location: Senate Floor

This bill would prohibit the proceeds from the sale of bonds from being withdrawn by the school district or community college district for investment outside the county treasury. After all project costs related to the issuance of the bonds have been paid, the bill would require any remaining balance or surplus in the building fund of the school district or community college district to be applied to debt service.

**SB 1359 (Block) – Public postsecondary education: course materials**
League Position: **Support**
Location: Assembly Floor

This bill would require each campus of the California Community Colleges and the California State University, and would request each campus of the University of California, to identify in each published schedule of classes, to identify in the online version of the campus course schedule any courses that use digital course materials, even if at least in part.

### College Advocacy Tools

Each month, the League staff will provide sample letters, templates or fact sheets to support your local advocacy and government relations efforts.

- Sample Pell Grant Support Letter
- Sample Proposition 55 Board Resolution

---

*For more information, contact the League’s Government Relations and Communications staff:*

Lizette Navarette, Vice President for Strategy and Policy Development | lizette@ccleague.org
Samantha Demelo, Director, Communications and Marketing | sdemelo@ccleague.org
Ryan McElhinney, Legislative Advocate | ryan@ccleague.org