



Office of Government Relations

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

July 2015 Newsletter

Upcoming Events:

July 17- August 17:
Legislative Recess

July 28: North CCCCCO
Budget Workshop
Las Positas College

July 29-30: National
Consortium on College
Men of Color, In-Person
Meeting
San Diego, CA

July 30: South CCCCCO
Budget Workshop
San Bernardino Valley
College

**Strong Workforce Town
Hall Wrap-Up Meetings**
*August 25: Los Angeles
Trade Technical College*

*August 27:
353 Sacramento St.
10th Floor
San Francisco, CA*

*Follow bills tracked at:
www.ccleague.org/bills*

*Have an event you would
like to highlight? Send
event info to:
lizette@ccleague.org.*

Final Budget Supports Success, Equity and Access

A week after announcing a budget agreement with Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León and Assembly Speaker Toni Atkins, Governor Brown signed a balanced budget with expenditures totaling \$115.4 billion for 2015-16. The final budget was \$2.1 billion less than the spending plan the Assembly and Senate sent Governor Brown on June 15. The signed budget continues to restore California Community Colleges by investing in key areas such as student success, equity, and Cal Grants.

Community College Budget

The 2015-16 Budget Act had a few areas of notable difference from the Governor's May Revise. These included investment in the Cal Grant B, funds for the baccalaureate degree pilot program, and a slight reduction in resources for full-time faculty. Additionally, the adult education final budget allocation remained the same but with different policy parameters. The table below lists all areas of the final community college budget.

Expenditure Highlights

Early Education and Childcare. A centerpiece of the budget discussion this year revolved around early childhood education. The final agreement included an increase of \$423 million (18 percent) from the 2014-15 Budget Act level. New program enhancements and expansions account for the vast majority of the increase with the largest augmentations going to reimbursement rates and additional slots. This initiative is part of a growing move to reinsert elements of child care and early child care education back into Proposition 98 without "rebenching", or recalculating, to include the cost demands of a new program in the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Full-Time Faculty. The 2015-16 budget provides \$62.3 million from the Proposition 98 General Fund to increase full-time faculty at colleges and adopts budget bill language that requires colleges with lower faculty numbers to hire more faculty. The agreement narrowed tiers to a range beginning at \$73,057 (the Governor's May Revise proposed \$70,000) to \$125,000 (the Governor's May revise proposed \$190,000). Additionally, the language requires colleges to use all of the funding on full- or part-time faculty, including part-time faculty office hours.

Adult Education. The budget agreement maintained the \$500 million amount for the Adult Education Block Grant but added \$25 million for adult education data. The compromise funds K-12 adult school based on the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) in all 10 categories as opposed to the five categories included in the AB 86 Consortia Plans, but would cap the total MOE at \$375 million. The agreement specifies that joint powers agencies may participate as adult education consortia members. The compromise allows specific older adult programs pertaining to workforce development or caregiver programs to be funded by regional consortia. The \$25 million investment in one-time Proposition 98 funds is intended to support the development and collection of outcomes data relating to the effectiveness of each adult education consortia in meeting the educational and workforce training needs of adults. Trailer bill language further authorizes the Chancellor and Superintendent to collaborate on the development of common outcome data collection, and requires them to report to the Legislature by November 1, 2015 on its progress.

CalGrants. The budget includes \$39 million in Proposition 98 General Fund monies to augment Cal Grant B Access Awards for community college students who take 12 or more units. Based on estimated numbers, this will provide about 85,000 students with an additional \$450 each.

Basic Skills. The approved budget funds two new basic skills programs. The first is the Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation Program, which will provide \$60 million Proposition 98 General Fund to assist community college districts in improving the delivery of basic skills instruction. The second is the Basic Skills Partnership Pilot Program, which will provide five community college districts with \$2-million grants to develop partnerships among schools districts, community colleges and California State University campuses to develop improved strategies for remedial instruction of underprepared college students.

UC and CSU Enrollment Expectations. The budget agreement sets enrollment expectations for UC and CSU. For UC, the budget sets an expectation for the system to enroll at least 5,000 additional resident undergraduate students by the 2016-17 academic year and authorizes the Director of Finance to augment UC's budget by \$25 million should UC demonstrate prior to May 1, 2016 that it will meet the state's expectation. For CSU, the budget states a goal to increase enrollment by at least 10,400 resident full-time equivalent students.

**Final 2015-16 Budget Agreement – California Community Colleges
Signed June, 24, 2015**

Item (In Thousands)	2014-15 Enacted Totals	2015-16 May Revise Totals	2015-16 Budget Agreement Totals	Increase Over 2014-15
<i>Ongoing Funds</i>				
Cost of Living Adjustment	0.85%	\$61,000 (1.02%)	\$61,000 (1.02%)	0.17%
Enrollment Growth	2.75%	\$156,500 (3%)	\$156,500 (3%)	0.25%

Student Success and Support Program (SSSP)	\$199,183	\$299,183	\$299,183	\$100,000
SSSP - Equity	\$70,000	\$185,000	\$155,000	\$85,000
Institutional Effectiveness	\$2,500	\$17,500	\$17,500	\$15,000
Base Augmentation	\$0	\$266,700	\$266,692	\$266,692
Career Development College Preparation (CDCP) Rate Equalization	\$0	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000
Full-Time Faculty	\$0	\$75,000	\$62,320	\$62,320
Apprenticeship Programs	\$22,868	51,924	51,924	\$29,056
Categorical Program COLA	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500*	\$2,500
EOPS	\$89,509	\$0	\$123,189	\$33,680
Full-Time Cal Grant B Student Financial Aid Program	Not Included	Not Included	\$39,000	\$39,000
One-Time Funds				
Career Technical Education Pathways	\$50,000	\$48,000	\$48,000	
Mandates	\$49,500	\$627,800	604,043	
Deferred Maintenance & Instructional Equipment	\$148,000	\$148,000*	\$148,000*	
Remaining Deferrals	\$600,000	\$94,465	\$94,465	
Basic Skills & Student Outcomes Transformation Program	Not Included	\$60,000	\$60,000	
Baccalaureate Degree Start-up	Not Included	\$0	\$6,000	
Financial Aid Administration	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	

Innovation Awards	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	
<i>Funding Tied to Partnerships</i>				
Basic Skills Partnership Pilot Program (One-Time)	Not Included	\$2,000	\$10,000	
Adult Education	\$25,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	
Adult Education Data (One-Time)	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	
<i>Other</i>				
Prop 39	\$37,500	\$38,700	\$38,800	

The Case for Student Equity

In 2010 the Community College League of California's Commission on the Future established a vision that "In California, all residents will have the opportunity to complete a quality postsecondary education in a timely manner." Underlying this vision were three equally important values—access, success and equity. In the last few years, many efforts have set colleges on a path to improve student access and success, but it was not until 2014 when Governor Brown included funding for the campus-level Student Equity Plans that real momentum began to build on significant concrete efforts to reduce inequities. Today, California community colleges, with guidance from the State Chancellor's Office and support from organizations such as the League, have the opportunity to make notable improvements in the policies and practices that affect student equity.

To further support the momentum that is building at colleges around student equity, the League's Government Relations team wrote a thought paper on equity with the goal of reflecting on our own institutions and how we as employees and trustees of the "system" need to see our own role in advancing student equity – especially now with an unparalleled amount of funding and exceptional opportunity. The League will continue to encourage courageous dialogue on ways to improve student equity.

To view the report and its recommendations, please [click here](#).

Should the State Revisit the Master Plan...Again?



On June 29, higher education thought leaders, including League Board President Louise Jaffe, participated in "The Road Ahead for Higher Ed", a higher education conference analyzing the central question: *Is it time for a new Master Plan? Or, a new model?*

The original Master Plan was approved in principle by the Regents and the State Board of Education (which at that time governed the California State University and California Community Colleges) and submitted to the Legislature. A special session of the 1960 Legislature passed the Donahoe Higher Education Act

(Title 3, Division 5, Part 40, of the Education Code beginning at Section 66000), which included many of the Master Plan recommendations as well as additional legislation necessary to implement the plan. However, many of the key aspects of the Master Plan were never enacted into law. Today, the Master Plan is symbolic of the golden age of the “Golden State” which today appears to be sorely inadequate in meeting the needs of students, employers, and California.

Throughout the day, several panels pondered the question of whether the Master Plan maintained relevance in light of the state’s fiscal and workforce realities, or if a new approach was instead needed. Panels shared various principles that should be considered if California once again decides to craft a strategic approach and vision for higher education. For one, it needs to be adaptive and nimble enough to account for demographic changes, an unpredictable workforce, and include the ability to build capacity through a sustainable financial model. Accountability and coordination were key elements of discussion and areas that stakeholders felt were needed in any update of the Master Plan. The discussion centered on a bill making its way through the legislature – SB 42 (Liu) - and whether a coordinating council will provide the accountability legislators demand and the coordination between higher education segments stakeholders seek. Previous efforts in the legislature have focused on improving student transitions between each higher education system – a point that stakeholders on the panels saw as a major weakness of the Master Plan.

While there wasn’t a clear answer, one thing was evident – California must learn from its experience in higher education.

Must Read

By: Dr. Rita Mize

Interim Vice President, Community College League of California

Rich Schools, Poor Students: Tapping Large University Endowments to Improve Student Outcomes. Jorge Klor de Alva and Mark Schneider. Nexus Research and Policy Center, San Francisco. April 2015

This report notes that in addition to proposing a tuition-free community college plan in early 2015, President Obama also called for effective support services to assist students in staying in college and completing their degrees or certificates and/or transferring to four-year institutions. Rather than free tuition, which already exists for most students who need it – especially in California -- this study maintains that student support services are actually the area of greater need for funding support.

The authors propose that these support services be funded by eliminating the tax exemptions of very wealthy private, not-for-profit institutions. They then argue that these “private” colleges are in effect heavily subsidized by their tax-exempt endowments which provide more funds per student than public colleges and universities that educate the majority of the nation’s low- and middle-class students.

As an example, the authors estimate that in 2013, Princeton University’s tax exempt status generated more than \$100,000 per full-time equivalent student in taxpayer subsidies, compared to around \$12,000 per student at Rutgers University (the state flagship), \$4,700 per student at the

nearby regional Montclair State University, and only \$2,400 per student at Essex Community College.

Read more at: http://nexusresearch.org/reports/Rich_Schools_Poor_Students.pdf

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

Rita Mize, Interim Vice President | rmize@ccleague.org

Lizette Navarette, Legislative Advocate | lizette@ccleague.org

Ryan McElhinney, Legislative Advocate | ryan@ccleague.org

Melodie Smith, Program Associate | msmith@ccleague.org