



Office of Government Relations

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

May 2014 Newsletter

Upcoming Events:

All bills must pass out of their first policy committee.
May 8th, 2014

Consultation Council
May 15th, 2014
1102 Q Street, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

Governor Revises 2014-15 Budget
May 14th, 2014
Sacramento, CA

Board of Governors Meeting
May 19th – 20th
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

All bills must pass out of their first appropriation committee.
May 23rd, 2014

**Student Equity Plan Institute
Center for Urban Education**
May 29th – May 30th
The Omni Hotel
Downtown, Los Angeles

Great Teachers Seminar
La Casa de Maria
Santa Barbara, CA
Contact: ehawkins@facecc.org

League Happenings

Over the past month, League staff have been advocating to make sure legislators are considering the needs of community colleges. The League believes the Governor's proposed budget is a solid investment in access, success and equity. We share his vision that each of these areas plays an indispensable part in providing the best possible educational experience for our students. For a document that will go into more depth about the proposed budget, please click [here](#). We encourage you to forward it along to any interested party.

The next important item on the calendar for community colleges is the May Revise, when the Governor adjusts his budget proposal to take into account revenues the state has received since January. If there is more revenue than has been projected, the League has been asking the legislature and the Governor to target that money to improve student outcomes. Specifically we would like the money to go for:

Increase the enhanced noncredit rate for Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) classes to the full credit rate. This was part of the original intent in discussions of the Workgroup on Community College Finance and was originally proposed to be included in SB 361/2006. In this era of student success, this proposal would provide a more dynamic approach to the delivery of remedial education. The financial disincentive to offer non-credit instruction would no longer exist. This augmentation will enable colleges to provide pre-assessment review classes and innovative and effective basic skills courses, which may be better tailored to remedial students. In addition, remedial students may be more inclined to enroll in non-credit remedial courses, which have no fee and will not start their respective financial aid eligibility clock.

Resources to convert 400 part-time faculty positions to full-time status. These new full-time faculty will enable the system to continue the momentum of student success and contribute to equity within the system.

Resources for career-technical education to create an incentive for more experimental and innovative programs.

Resources for professional development to provide training for new full-time faculty and for classified staff to ensure all college employees can be as effective as possible in their positions.

Resources to restore Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), and CalWORKs.

With increased non-proposition 98 General Fund money, resources to increase both the number of Competitive Cal Grant B awards (currently at 22,500 awards) and the award level (currently at \$1,473).

Capitol Context

The month of April was a busy time in Sacramento. By early May, all legislation must have passed out of their first policy committee hearing. Legislative committees and staff are very busy considering a range of legislation affecting community colleges. Important bills affecting your colleges have been listed below; please contact either Ryan McElhinney or Lizette Navarette at (916) 444-8641.

Accreditation: A number of bills relating to accreditation were acted on this month. Some, like SB 1068 (Beall) and AB 1942 (Bonta) would have fundamentally changed the accrediting process in California by permitting colleges to choose their own federally recognized accrediting agency. The League feels having multiple accrediting agencies judging different colleges would result in a mish-mash of academic rigor and standards throughout the community college system. Therefore we adopted an OPPOSE position. Both bills passed out of their policy committees after taking amendments removing the provisions related to colleges choosing their own accrediting agency. League staff are reviewing the amendments and we may be able to drop our opposition to the bills.

The other two accreditation measures, SB 965 (Leno) and AB 2087 (Ammiano), were more narrowly focused. SB 965 (Leno) provides a stable funding mechanism for the City College of San Francisco (CCSF). The League supported this bill as long as provisions were included that ensures the Board of Governors was required appoint a special trustee to ensure these funds were well spent. Once amendments were adopted to protect the state's interest, the League supported the bill and it was passed out of the Senate Education Committee.

The other bill, AB 2087 would have prevented the Board of Governors from appointing a special trustee that usurped the powers of a locally-elected board. As the organization that represents those locally boards, the League felt that existing regulations were enough to ensure this option would be rarely used and therefore adopted an OPPOSE position. After taking amendments to remove that language with extraordinary powers, the League dropped its opposition. Last week it passed the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

Baccalaureate Degrees: On April 24, the Senate Education Committee passed SB 850 with author's amendments on an 8-0 vote. SB 850 (Block) would authorize the community college baccalaureate pilot program. The key amendments included: 1) excluding degrees already offered by public postsecondary institutions, 2) limiting participation in the pilot program to 15 campuses from 15 different districts, 3) authorizing the pilot for 8 years beginning January 1, 2015, and sunseting on July 1, 2023, and 4) prohibiting fees for lower-division coursework in a baccalaureate degree program from exceeding the fees for other lower-division coursework. San Diego CCD Chancellor Constance Carroll and Yuba CCD Chancellor Doug provided lead testimony in support of the bill. SB 850 will be heard in Senate Appropriations Committee in mid-May.

Concurrent Enrollment: AB 1451 (Holden), the System's sponsored legislation on concurrent enrollment, passed out of the Assembly Education Committee on April 30 with a 7-0 vote. Assemblymember Holden accepted amendments to clarify that community college courses would not supplant courses offered by the high school. The bill received wide support from business, social justice organizations, school districts, and community colleges. League staff testified in support and will continue to meet with Legislators to build further support. AB 1451 will be heard in mid-May in Senate Appropriations Committee.

Stay informed about legislation tracked by the League: <http://www.ccleague.org/bills>

Fully Funding Non-Credit Courses

A budget priority for the League is to fulfill the promise made by SB 361 and equalize funding between credit and non-credit courses. Please see below for a brief on the importance of fully funding noncredit courses would mean to our colleges:

Background

Currently, the nine noncredit education categories eligible for community college funding established in Education Code §84757 are:

- Elementary and secondary basic skills
- English as a second language
- Immigrant education
(citizenship and workforce preparation)
- Programs for adults with disabilities
- Short-term career technical education
- Parenting
- Older adult programs
- Health and safety
- Home economics

Last year in the May Revision, the Governor proposed that five noncredit categories (elementary and secondary basic skills, English as a second language, immigrant education, adults with disabilities, short-term career technical education) be funded by a new “Adult Education Partnership” program; however, a community college district could still be funded through the regular apportionment for all nine noncredit categories.

Courses and Goals

Five of the nine non-credit categories are of particular importance for the success of students because these courses provide a demonstrated pathway to enrollment in credit programs, entry or re-entry into the job market, and critical citizenship and workforce skills for New Americans. It should be noted that these five categories are the focus of the Assembly Bill 86 adult education planning process currently underway. Specifically, these areas of noncredit instruction provide:

- Students in need of remedial coursework with basic skills in reading, writing and computation to enable them to be successful in college-level coursework. (Data show that 71% of those who are prepared for college work at entry to community colleges are successful in meeting their goals; while very few are successful if they arrive with less-adequate preparation.) These noncredit courses can provide the essential “bridge” to enable students to be ready for college-level work and ultimately increase the numbers of Californians who receive certificates and degrees.
- Immigrants with English language skills needed to gain employment become citizens or pursue further academic study.
- Basic skills or vocational education for students with disabilities to enable them to achieve maximum independence.
- Short-term career technical education to provide students with the skills needed for job entry or re-entry, as well as career advancement or change. Noncredit CTE programs enable students to enter gainful employment while pursuing their long-term educational goals.

Funding

In 2013-14, community colleges received \$4,636 per FTES for credit courses; \$3,282 per FTES for “enhanced” noncredit (noncredit courses in Career Development and College Preparation [CDCP]), and \$2,788 per FTES for regular noncredit instruction. The disparity in funding between the noncredit CDCP rate and the credit rate means that districts which offer essential noncredit programs are unable to provide the additional supports, which have been shown to lead to greater student success. These include: full-time faculty, faculty office hours, and other critical supports for increasing the successful completion of these courses and programs. These supportive services are currently missing from CDCP programs but particularly important for this segment of the population because these are students who are not academically prepared for credit college level

work or need vital English skills to fully engage in American society. In addition, noncredit programs need professional development resources, the finalization of metrics to evaluate noncredit programs, and dedicated Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) resources to provide orientation, assessment, placement, counseling and education plans for noncredit students.

Rationale

The current level of apportionment for CDCP (Career Development and College Preparation) enhanced noncredit classes and programs, at only 71% of the credit rate, does not provide adequate funding for noncredit programs that endeavor to support job readiness, provide a gateway to enrollment in credit classes, and attract and retain quality faculty and staff. Therefore, the Report of the Workgroup on Community College Finance (2004) recommended, and there was general agreement that, apportionment funding should be increased for CDCP courses to the full credit rate when funds were available to increase student success and completion. CCLC supports the equalization of funding rates between credit instruction and the Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) program. Based upon the number of CDCP FTES funded at the 2013-14 First Principal apportionment, it is estimated this would cost roughly \$50 million. The reality within the community college system is that roughly 75% of students arrive at the colleges unprepared for college level and need remediation. If reimbursement rates were equalized, the financial disincentive to primarily offer pre-collegiate credit instruction would no longer exist. Such an approach would provide community colleges with another option to address remediation and students with another delivery method for instruction. Noncredit students would pay no fees to enroll in remediation courses, which would be better designed and more flexible for this student population. Short, intensive formats with open-entry enrollment would be the norm rather than the traditional 16-week regular credit course. Instruction could be provided in an acceleration format or some other intensification environment, which could be an option for CTE or Basic Skills courses. Finally, because a student would pay no fees, the student could delay the start of his/her financial aid eligibility “clock” and have only credit classes count toward the degree, certificate or educational goal chose.

The need for additional resources for more effective programs was also cited in *In a Time of Scarce Resources: Near Term Priorities in Adult Education*¹ whose authors note the importance of adult education for meeting the economic and social needs of 21st century citizenry. They argue that “the present adult education system [must be transformed] into a more effective and coordinated adult education and workforce development system” and that doing so requires reaching a broader population base as well as moving to a model of high intensity and managed enrollment, articulation with K-12 programs, providing guidance and counseling to develop learning plans for each student, introducing some technology where appropriate, and collecting research and data to assess the effectiveness of these programs to accelerate learning gains and provide better services for these students.

Why is this an Important Issue Now and Not in the Past?

¹ ¹Forrest Chisman and Gail Spangenberg, Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy, New York, July 25, 2012.

EdSource researchers have written: “...although this triad [developmental, occupational and academic transfer] of functions reflects the reality of what the California Community Colleges do, the commitment to developmental education is neither as firmly entrenched nor as widely accepted as the other two commitments.”

Various examinations of the history of the community colleges explain some of the reasons.... [Patrick] “Callan² points out that, ...[when the Master Plan for Higher Education was developed in 1960], there was little formal recognition that graduates from the state’s K-12 education system might arrive at college unprepared for college-level academic work. In the years since, the proportion of community college students identified as needing developmental education has grown steadily, likely for several reasons. The state has seen a dramatic increase in the number and proportion of high school graduates who pursue postsecondary education, in part because of increasingly sophisticated workplace demands and the growing complexity of our society and economy. Demographics also play a role: the state’s population has become more diverse at the same time that inequities in access and success among different student groups have become more visible and less tolerated. Simultaneously, California’s K-12 education system has weakened in terms of the resources provided to schools compared with most other states.”³

Thus, this issue has reached crucial proportions, which require that California renew its commitment to pre-collegiate basic skills so that California Community Colleges can innovatively meet the needs of these students to become full participants in the economy and active citizens of this state.

Must Read

Contingent Commitment: Bringing Part-time Faculty into Focus: A Special Report from the Center for Community College Student Engagement. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin. Program in Higher Education Leadership. 2014.
http://www.ccsse.org/docs/PTF_Special_Report.pdf

This report focuses on part-time faculty, noting that while they comprise the majority of faculty within community colleges throughout the nation, teaching for them “turns ...into a transaction that is defined by a few specific tasks and there often is no expectation – or even invitation – to do more.” Further, most colleges see themselves as having no obligation to them beyond the current academic term. As a result, part-time faculty often have no interaction with other faculty, do not have the time and space to meet with students outside of class, are not included in developing

² President, Higher Education Policy Institute; former president, National Center for Public Policy & Higher Education, former staff director, California’s Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

³ Perry, M.; Bahr, P.R.; et.al. (2010) *Course-taking Patterns, Policies, and Practices in Development Education in the California Community Colleges.* Mountain View, CA: EdSource. Page 3.

courses and innovative approaches, are not included in professional development activities, and are not recognized as essential for the success of students.

This study argues that colleges should do more for part-time faculty because of their important role in educating students. Among other items, this report suggests that existing dollars should be reallocated to make sure that part-time faculty have the support they need to help students succeed. This report includes a “discussion guide” on topics for campus discussions designed to help high education institutions strengthen policies and practices supporting part-time faculty.

Practically Speaking: Community College Practices that Help (Re)define Student Support, a Practitioner Primer. Cooper, D., Rodriguez-Kiino, D., Scharper, A., Karandjeff, K., Chaplot, P., Schiorring, E., Taylor, S. Berkeley, CA: Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. 2014.

This primer features a broad range of practices with specific studies from various colleges that demonstrate each of the five key themes in very practical terms:

- 1) Colleges need to foster students’ motivation.
- 2) Colleges must teach students how to succeed in the postsecondary environment.
- 3) Colleges need to structure support to ensure all six success factors are addressed.
- 4) Colleges need to provide comprehensive support to students from historically underserved groups to prevent the equity gap from growing.
- 5) Everyone has a role to play in student achievement, but faculty must take the lead.

This report also includes “quick guides” to help the reader identify “featured practices” that can best inform their work to strength student support and success. These guides are then sorted into practices according to: 1) key theme from the study; 2) level (institution, program or individual); and 3) student success factor.

For more information, contact the League's Government Relations staff:

Theresa Tena, Vice President | ttena@ccleague.org
Rita Mize, Director of State Policy and Research | rmize@ccleague.org
Lizette Navarette, Legislative Advocate | lizette@ccleague.org
Ryan McElhinney, Legislative Advocate | ryan@ccleague.org
Melanie Smith, Program Associate | msmith@ccleague.org