

## Upcoming Events:

### Joint Hearing on Early Childhood Education

March 11<sup>th</sup>

9:00 am

State Capitol, Room 444

### Assembly Higher

### Education Committee

March 18<sup>th</sup>

State Capitol, Room 437

1:30 pm

### Assembly Budget

### Hearing on Community Colleges

April 2<sup>nd</sup>

State Capitol, Room 126

### Community College

### Public Relations

### Organization Conference

The Dream Inn

April 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>

### Senate Budget Hearing on Community Colleges

April 24<sup>th</sup>

State Capitol, Room 3191



## Office of Government Relations

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

### March 2014 Newsletter

#### In this Issue:

- Legislative Interest in Issues Affecting Community Colleges
- Write Up of a Legislative Hearing on Higher Education Accountability
- Report on the Hearing of the Select Committee on Community
- Budget Update

#### Legislative Interest in Issues Affecting Community Colleges

Currently, the Legislature is focused on three major issues that have been under discussion within the community college system in recent months:

- Accreditation and related issues
- The Applied Baccalaureate Degree
- Dual/Concurrent Enrollment

A brief description of the bills in each of these three categories follows. Further information on them, including the League's position and the "pros" and "cons" of each, as well as an analysis of other legislation can be found [here](#). Any questions about these topics or the bills should be directed to League staff at (916) 444-8641.

#### Accreditation

- AB 1199 (Fong) would provide three-year stability funding for colleges on "show cause" accreditation warnings. The League believes that the three-year provisions also should be extended to any college experiencing a drop in enrollment which is beyond its control. Examples would include a natural disaster.

- SB 965 (Leno), which is sponsored by the Chancellor's Office, would provide partial stability based on the level of resources provided to a district in 2013-14 if the institution meets specific criteria. City College of San Francisco meets the criteria of the bill, and a stability mechanism is outlined for the district through the 2017-18 fiscal year. Supporters of the bill believe that this legislation is necessary to prevent CCSF from losing significant resources due to enrollment loss even if its accreditation is renewed.

- AB 1942 (Bonta) would permit colleges to continue receiving state apportionment if they lose accreditation but are certified by the Board of Governors as meeting minimum conditions. It would also allow a local community college governing boards to designate a “federally-recognized” accreditation agency to oversee its institution(s).
- AB 2087 (Ammiano) would prohibit the Board of Governors (BOG) from appointing a special trustee with power to overrule a locally-elected board of trustees.

### **Baccalaureate Degrees**

- SB 850 (Block), as currently in print, would, for a period of eight years, authorize the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to establish one applied baccalaureate degree pilot program per campus, on a limited number of campuses, as determined by the Chancellor. Senator Block has indicated that he will be introducing substantive amendments to further limit the use of this degree.

### **Dual/Concurrent Enrollment**

- AB 1451 (Holden) would allow the board of a community college district to enter into partnership with school district(s) to set terms and conditions for dual enrollment of high school students. The bill would authorize community college districts to be funded for dually-enrolled students unless the school district has already received reimbursement for that instruction. The author has indicated that he will be amending the bill to include the requirement that high school students be recommended by their principal or designee for attendance; and will also provide exemptions to the current 5% summer school enrollment cap.
- AB 1540 (Hagman) would authorize the governing board of a community college district to enter into a formal partnership with a school district or districts located within its immediate service area to allow secondary school pupils to enroll in one or more courses of computer science at a community college if those pupils have exhausted all opportunities to enroll in an equivalent computer science course at the high school of attendance. This bill also would add computer science courses to the list of courses exempted from the 5% summer school limitation and reintroduce additional exemptions which were in law until January 2014.
- AB 2352 (Chesbro) would exempt students attending an early college high school from the current Education Code mandate that all dual enrollment students be given lowest registration priority; and also would exempt them from other statutory requirements if the student is enrolled in a community college course that is required for the student’s middle college or early college high school program.

## Legislative Hearing on Framework for Higher Education Accountability

On February 26, the Senate Education Committee and the Senate Budget Subcommittee #1 held a joint hearing on the topic of “Accountability for Postsecondary Education: A Framework for Informing Budget and Policy to Meet State Needs,” with Senators Marty Block and Carol Liu serving as joint chairs.

The hearing was a follow-up to SB 195 (Ch 367, Statutes of 2013) which established legislative intent that “budget and policy decisions regarding postsecondary education generally adhere to all of the following goals:

- (a) Improve student access and success, which shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following goals: greater participation by demographic groups, including low-income students that have historically participated at lower rates, greater completion rates by all students, and improved outcomes for graduates.
- (b) Better align degrees and credentials with the state’s economic, workforce, and civic needs.
- (c) Ensure the effective and efficient use of resources in order to increase high-quality postsecondary educational outcomes and maintain affordability.

The hearing included four sets of panels: representatives of the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office reviewing the various accountability measures and deadlines in the proposed budget; a panel on meeting public needs with Lande Joste of California Competes; Estella Bensimone of the USC Center for Urban Education, and Nancy Shulock from the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy; representatives of two out-of-state agencies on accountability in Indiana, Tennessee and Ohio; and a final panel of representatives of the three public higher education systems.

The community college accountability measures are different from the UC and CSU measures due to the differences in missions and primarily center around a number of the student success initiatives and concentration of services to help underachieving students.

The LAO outlined a number of questions for legislators to ask including: How was the measure developed? How do the measures relate to current goals? Who will track the measures? Who will set the targets? How are performance measures targets to be established?

Among the highlights of the hearing were the following:

- 1) Concern among many of the speakers about the lack of a coordinating body similar to the former California Postsecondary Education Commission;

2) A belief that stakeholders, including representatives of the higher education segments themselves as well as policymakers and business representatives, should continually assess the measures and whether goals are being met.

3) Questions from legislators on the value of rewarding systems which meet goals and how to deal with those who do not meet their goals. Instead of this, legislators were advised to use a more nuanced approach, such as working with the segments to develop expectations for performance and then determining why they are not meeting those expectations.

4) The need for more information on the cost of quality, whether differences in spending between the segments are appropriate to their missions; and information on the real cost of a degree (especially the BA) in different segments.

5) The need for several specific strategies including having an “honest broker” meeting with the segments to set statewide goals; publishing data and asking institutions to set their goals leading to the statewide goals; working on innovations and new models; a strong partnership with the Legislature so that there is a strong voice for higher education funding.

## **Assembly Select Committee on Community Colleges Meets re: The State of Community Colleges**

On February 18, the Assembly Select Committee on Community Colleges, chaired by Assemblymember Steve Fox, with members Bonilla, Cooley, Garcia, Gomez, Hall, Holden, Mullin, Salas, Wagner, and Wilk, held a hearing to consider three sets of questions:

- How is student success being tracked?
- How are community colleges preparing students for the future?
- How are funds in the current-year budget being used to help community college students achieve success?

Erik Skinner opened with a summary of the current state of the system and was followed by the three panels, each of which included a representative of the Chancellor’s Office – Linda Michalowski, Patrick Perry, and Dan Troy, respectively -- as well as other interested parties and outside researchers. These included Hans Johnson (PPIC), Colleen Moore (IHELP), Taylor Valmorris (Student Senate CCC), Alma Salazar (Vice President of Economic Workforce and Development, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce), Monte Perez (President, LA Mission College), and Barry Gribbons (Vice President, Instructional Development/Technology, College of the Canyons).

Following Erik’s overview of the current status of the system which included a renewed focus on using the incoming funds to rebuild a stronger system and increase student success, the panelists reported to the committee. Linda Michalowski discussed the recommendations of, and implementation of, the Student Success Task Force; Patrick Perry discussed the changes in the Scorecard; and Dan Troy noted the uses of current-year funding.

The responses of both the Assemblymembers and the other panelists were very positive, with respondents noting the tremendous importance of the colleges for educating first responders, for economic growth, and for increasing the number of baccalaureate-degree holders in the state. Colleen Moore called the Scorecard “a significant improvement over earlier accountability measures,” noting that it includes approximately two-thirds of community college students, while the earlier model included only about 40% of the student body. She cited the addition of more milestone measures, data on completion progress over terms, the disaggregation of data, and measurement of formerly-remedial students to determine their success in college English and mathematics as positive improvements. She also spoke affirmatively about the measurement of gaps between various groups and the accessibility and usefulness of the data for students and families as well as researchers. She suggested some additional improvements such as inclusion of the student/counselor ratio (which is a “work in progress”) and more in-depth analyses to break down gender within race. She also cited the “data on demand” feature as a good addition, and called the Scorecard “the most transparent accountability measure in the country.”

Hans Johnson was also complimentary, noting that the Scorecard is very transparent and the documentation is “impressive, and a model for other college systems.” His comments regarding additional data needs were primarily for items outside the control of the community colleges, including the need for a statewide data system from preschool through graduate school (P – 20); more work on improving the pathway from community colleges to the four-year systems and for certificates; the need for statewide goals and for updating Master Plan eligibility for CSU and UC; a determination of statewide transfer and certificate goals, and reinstitution of a higher education coordinating body. Patrick Perry also noted that some of the next steps include using resources which the governor has proposed for the budget year to create a Student Success Institute so teams would be available to visit colleges and assist them in implementing best practices.

In other testimony, members and speakers cited the Long Beach Promise program and implementation of a similar program at both LA Mission and East LA Colleges; work with veterans and the increasing numbers of veterans’ centers on campuses; the work of “Doing What Matters” and the braiding of economic development resources; cross-sector partnerships across silos to align Workforce Investment Boards with community colleges and four-year institutions; and the efforts of College of the Canyons to educate for high-need occupations.

Alma Salazar commended Chancellor Harris and his staff for their stewardship and leadership on implementation of the Student Success Task Force recommendations and noted that LA Trade Tech (as well as LA Mission and East LA Colleges which were cited above) has instituted important programs and interventions to assist students toward success. She also noted that more associate degrees for transfer need to be implemented in some areas, career technology education needs continued investment and improvement, and dual enrollment legislation is essential for providing additional links between high schools and community colleges.

When asked about issues for future hearings, members suggested the following as possibilities: accreditation, the current status of developing additional baccalaureate degrees to meet state employment needs, transfer, and the importance of continued access for our neediest students.

## **Budget Update**

Budget hearings and dialogue will intensify in March and April as legislative leaders and staff answer outstanding questions about the Governor's proposed budget and begin to develop legislative budget priorities. Budget watchers anxiously await the possibility additional revenues may materialize when the Governor unveils his May Revision on May 14<sup>th</sup>. Revenue information will be closely watched to determine which fiscal year the revenue is scored, how it will be classified (one-time vs. ongoing), and the overall percentage owed to Proposition 98. Community college budget advocates remain closely focused on two augmentations proposed – the resources provided for enrollment restoration and the student success services program. [Click here to view additional information](#) related to internal community college milestones such as the First Principal apportionment, Education Trailer bill language, and LAO recommendations related to the budget.