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Mission Statement

“Empowering Community Colleges Through Leadership, Advocacy and Support.”

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, by statute, provides leadership and policy direction in the continuing development of the California Community Colleges system. Among its charges are establishing minimum academic and personnel standards; evaluating and reporting on the fiscal and educational effectiveness of the 72 districts; conducting research and providing appropriate information services; and administering fiscal support programs (both operational and capital outlay).

The 17-member board, appointed by the Governor, includes 12 public members (two of whom must be current or former elected members of local boards); one voting and one nonvoting student member currently enrolled in a community college; two voting tenured faculty members; and one voting classified staff member.

The work of the Board is supported by the staff of the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges.

*The time listed for meeting of the Board of Governors are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*
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9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
1300 H Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

July 11-12, 2011

at

Chancellor’s Office
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
916.445.8752

This Agenda is available at www.cccco.edu
CCC Shared Governance Hour • July 2011
See it on 3CTV Channel 80 or on the web at http://www.3cmediasolutions.org/
Live from Sacramento
California Community Colleges Board of Governors Meeting
Monday, July 11, 9:30 am - 5:00 pm
Tuesday, July 12, 8:30 am - 12:00 pm
Channel: 3CTV

Watch the live broadcast (or visit 3C Media Solutions’ website for the link to the webcast) of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors meeting. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges sets policy and provides guidance for the 72 districts and 112 colleges, which constitute the system. The 17-member Board, appointed by the state’s Governor, formally interacts with state and federal officials and other state organizations. Legislation affecting the California Community Colleges is, for the most part, channeled through the Board of Governors and presented to the Legislature. For more information about the Board of Governors, please visit the Chancellor’s Office website.

REBROADCAST DATE:
Unavailable for the live broadcast?
Watch the meeting rebroadcast in its entirety on:
Monday, July 18, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm
Channel: 3CTV

How to participate (applies to both live and rebroadcast events):
- Visit http://www.3cmediasolutions.org/pages/programming/how-to-view.html to find an Affiliate nearest to you.
- Contact your Affiliate to set up a viewing room or make arrangements for program to be videotaped.
- Tune into 3CTV for this event!
- Or, visit www.3cmediasolutions.org for the link to the webcast and watch from your desktop!

Minimum System Requirements
- Windows (Pentium)
- 32 Mb RAM (64 Mb highly recommended)
- Internet access with at least a 56K modem (ideally DSL, cable, T1 or above)
- Microsoft Internet Explorer v. 5.5 or higher
  (it’s recommended you download the newest version for a better experience)
- Windows Media Player (v. 6.4 or higher)
- Sound card
- Speakers or headphones

For immediate assistance, please contact: tel: 760-744-1150 Ext. 2607
3C Media Solutions (formerly CCCSAT) is funded by a grant from the Chancellor’s Office, California Community Colleges.

Programs subject to change without notice.
Check the 3C Media Solutions’ website for the latest broadcast schedule.
Click here to be removed from our mailing list.

*The time listed for meeting of the Board of Governors are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*
Board of Governors Meeting
Monday, July 11, 2011
9:30 a.m.*
The Sterling Hotel
1300 H Street
Sacramento, California 95814

All Board of Governors meetings are held in locations that are wheelchair accessible. Other disability-related accommodations, such as alternate media materials, sign language interpreters, or real time transcription, will be provided to persons with disabilities upon request. Persons requesting such accommodations should notify Njeri Griffin, 1102 Q Street, Sacramento, California, 95811, ngriffin@cccco.edu, (916) 445.8508, no less than five working days prior to the meeting. The Chancellor’s Office will make efforts to meet requests made after such date, if possible.

Public testimony will be invited in conjunction with Board discussion on each item. A written request to address the Board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.

Persons wishing to make a presentation to the Board on a subject not on the Agenda shall address the Board during the time listed for Public Forum.

Items placed on the Consent Calendar will be voted on by a single Board action, without staff or public presentations, and without Board discussion. Any Board member may remove an item from Consent by informing the President of this intent. A member of the public may request that an item be removed from Consent by filling out a request to testify in accordance with section 41 of these Procedures, or by asking a Board member to remove an item from Consent. The item shall then be removed from Consent if any Board member exercises his or her authority to remove an item from Consent.

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance
SPECIAL PRESENTATION

2011 Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Awards Item 1.1
This item honors former Board of Governors member Dr. John W. Rice and recognizing this year’s three recipients of the 2011 Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Award.

BREAK TO RETURN TO THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Resolution for Former Board member Robert V. “Bobby” McDonald Item 1.2
This item presents a resolution to former Board member Robert V. “Bobby” McDonald.

Resolution for Dr. Norman Levan Item 1.3
This item presents a resolution to Dr. Norman Levan.

Certificate of Appreciation for Stephanie Puentes Item 1.4
This item presents a certificate of appreciation to Stephanie Puentes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of the Minutes Item 2.1
May 9-10, 2011, Board Meeting Minutes

Approval of Contracts and Grants Item 2.2
This item presents contracts and grants for Board approval.

2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan Item 2.3
This item requests approval of the California Community Colleges 2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan prepared pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 13100-02 and Education Code sections 67501 and 67503.

ACTION

Proposed Amendment to Board of Governors Standing Orders, Chapter 3, Article 333 – Student Senate Item 3.1
This item is the second reading of the proposed amendments to the Standing Order related to the Student Senate for the Board of Governors consideration.

*The time listed for meeting of the Board of Governors are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*
Proposed Title 5 Change on Apportionment Limit for Enrollment in Credit Courses (Sections 55024, 55040, 55042, 58161, and 58161.5)  
Item 3.2  
This item presents for a second reading and Board consideration the proposed title 5 changes to place a limit on apportionment funding for repeated enrollments in credit courses.

Lunch

FIRST READING

Proposed Revisions to the Title 5 Regulations Noncredit Course and Program Approval (Sections 55150, 55151, 55152, 55153, 55154 and 55155)  
Item 4.1  
This item proposes changes to regulations as they relate to noncredit course and program approval in title 5 sections 55150 through 55155, inclusive.

Board of Governors Meeting Locations for 2012  
Item 4.2  
This item gives the Board the opportunity to discuss possible site locations for Board meetings in 2012.

INFORMATION AND REPORTS

Update on the Activities of the Foundation for California Community Colleges  
Item 5.1  
The item presents an update to the Board on the activities of the Foundation for California Community Colleges.

State Budget Update  
Item 5.2  
This item presents an update on developments related to the State Budget.

Update of the 2012-13 System Budget Request  
Item 5.3  
This item provides the Board with an update on the status of the 2012-13 System Budget Request.

State and Federal Legislative Update  
Item 5.4  
The Board will be provided with an update on both state and federal activities.

Little Hoover Commission Report  
Item 5.5  
The Board will hear a presentation from Stuart Drown, Executive Director of the Little Hoover Commission.
PUBLIC FORUM

People wishing to make a presentation to the Board on a subject not on the Agenda shall observe the following procedures:

A. A written request to address the Board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.
B. Written testimony may be of any length, but 50 copies of any written material are to be provided.
C. An oral presentation is limited to three minutes. A group wishing to present on the same subject is limited to 10 minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

*The time listed for meeting of the Board of Governors are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*
RECOGNITION

Recognition for Deborah Malumed, Immediate Past President of the Board of Governors  
This item acknowledges the leadership and dedication of Dr. Deborah Malumed, Immediate Past President of the Board of Governors.

Recognition for the Past President of the Student Senate  
This item recognizes Alex Pader, 2010-11 President of the Student Senate.

INFORMATION AND REPORTS

Update on the California STEM Learning Network  
The Board will hear a presentation by Chris Roe, Chief Executive Officer of the California STEM Learning Network.

Update on Student Enrollment and Course Offering Trends  
The Board will be provided with a summary of the most current student enrollment and course offering statistics through the end of Fall 2010.

Board Member Reports  
Board members will report on their activities since the last Board meeting.

GUEST SPEAKERS

Mike Kirst, President of the State Board of Education and Sue Burr, Executive Director of the State Board of Education  
This item will provide an update on the activities of the State Board of Education to the Board of Governors.
**PUBLIC FORUM**

People wishing to make a presentation to the Board on a subject not on the *Agenda* shall observe the following procedures:

A. A written request to address the Board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.
B. Written testimony may be of any length, but 50 copies of any written material are to be provided.
C. An oral presentation is limited to three minutes. A group wishing to present on the same subject is limited to 10 minutes.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

*The time listed for meeting of the Board of Governors are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*
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2011 Dr. JOHN W. RICE DIVERSITY AND EQUITY AWARDS

SPECIAL PRESENTATION
Presentation: Scott Himelstein, President, Board of Governors
Jack Scott, Chancellor, California Community Colleges

Item 1.1

Issue

This item honors former Board of Governors member Dr. John W. Rice and recognizes this year’s three recipients for the 2011 John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Awards. Joining the Board will be special guest Mrs. Clara Rice.

Background

The Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Award was established in 2001 to honor a community college staff member, district, college, or program that has made the greatest contribution towards faculty and staff diversity or student equity.

This award is named in honor of former Board of Governors member Dr. John W. Rice. He served on the Board from 1992-2000 and was a leader, innovator, and spokesperson for equal employment opportunity and nondiscrimination in the California Community Colleges. This award is named in his behalf as a testament to his strong commitment to faculty and staff diversity, student equity, and his strong support for a multicultural learning experience for all students.

This marks the 11th annual Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Awards. The previous ten award winners are: 2001 George Ow, Jr. from Cabrillo College; 2002 Dr. Brenda Flyswithhawks from Santa Rosa Junior College and Pam Chao from American River College; 2003 Dr. Dibaker Barua from Golden West College and Cabrillo Advancement Program from Cabrillo College; 2004 Dr. Nadine Hata from El Camino College and President Ernest Moreno from East Los Angeles College, and Standing Guard Project from Sierra College; 2005 Charles West from Bakersfield College and Abel Nunez from Taft College; 2006 Don Dorsey from Foothill College, Diversity Action Council from Evergreen Valley College, and Student Equity Program from Riverside Community College District (CCD); 2007 Digital Bridge Academy from Cabrillo College and Respect, Integrity, and Self Determination through Education (RISE) Program from Sacramento City College; 2008 Neelam Canto-Lugo from Yuba CCD and Freshman Seminar from Cosumnes River College; 2009 Early Start Program from Los Angeles Valley College, Cultural Democracy Initiative from Sacramento City College; and 2010 Transition to Independent Living Program from Taft College and Elaine Moore from El Camino College.
All of the past and present Dr. John W. Rice Awards and ceremony expenses have been generously supported by the Foundation for California Community Colleges and private donations. Each recipient will receive a commemorative award.

The following individuals nominated the recipients: Laura Welby, Faculty Recognition Committee Chair for Academic Senate and Associate Professor, Drafting/Computer Assisted Drafting/Interior Design from Santa Barbara City College (Santa Barbara Community College District); David Viar, President and Oranit Limmaneeprasert, Chair of Equity Committee and Professor of English as a Second Language from American River College (Los Rios Community College District); and Magdalena Torres, Special Program Advisor in charge of the Veterans Support Program also from Santa Barbara City College. Staff from the California Community Colleges including a Chancellor and Chancellor’s Office served on the selection committee. There were many nominees and the decision was difficult but the three recipients clearly demonstrated an outstanding achievement in diversity and/or student equity.

As our system continues to grow, it is important to understand diversity as an issue of representation and progress. Demographically, we are serving the most diverse student population in the history of California’s community colleges. Learning to facilitate the needs of our emerging student body through staff training and professional development increases the probability that our students will be successful. With this commitment and the tireless efforts of our administrators, faculty, staff, and students, we can make progress on the vision that Dr. John W. Rice saw for the California Community Colleges. This year’s recipients represent an important combination of strategies that express our resolve to both faculty and staff diversity and student equity and success.

**The 2011 Award Winners**

The following is a short description of the award winners and some of their highlighted diversity or equity accomplishments which are summarized or taken directly from their nomination form and additional information received:

**Mr. Ignacio Ponce:** Ignacio Ponce is the first tenure-track Deaf instructor at Santa Barbara City College and has been a faculty member since 2007. Prior to his employment at Santa Barbara City College, Ignacio worked in the nonprofit/human services field for almost 15 years, including three years as an advocate for the Deaf. He earned a B.A. in Deaf Studies from California State University Northridge, holds a post-baccalaureate certificate in Rehabilitation Administration from San Diego State University and he is working on a Master in Sign Language Teaching at Gallaudet University. His involvement in the community includes serving on the Independent Living Resource Center’s Board of Directors, and the Santa Barbara Mayor’s Breakfast committee. Some of his highlighted accomplishments for diversity and equity are:
Doubled enrollment from 100 to 200 students enrolled in the American Sign Language (ASL) classes and enlarged the course offerings from beginning to advance ASL.

Successfully instilled interest for the language of Deaf people by instituting an award winning student-centered ASL Club. The ASL Club offers students an opportunity to raise awareness and funds by providing cultural and social events in which campus and community members are educated and introduced to the cultural and linguistic contributions of American Deaf community members. Ignacio was the ASL Club adviser for three years in which he successfully built a strong foundation for future advisers and members to follow.

Enhanced the linguistic and cultural ASL Summer Immersion program to incorporate campus and community members into the socio-linguistic/cultural awareness component of the program. The ASL Summer Immersion Institute is a three day event where students are fully immersed in ASL. This includes communicating only in ASL during the three day immersion, attending Deaf and social events and interacting with members of the Deaf community to maximize student exposure to the language and culture, mirroring a study abroad immersion program.

Successfully organized “Deaf Panel” presentations every semester. The “Deaf Panel” presentations have served as an outlet to Deaf community members to voice their experiences living in the hearing world. The panel also serves as a venue where faculty, students and members of the community can clarify myths and misconceptions about being Deaf.

His colleagues and students have become more conscious and actively aware of how to linguistically and culturally engage him and fellow Deaf community members in campus-wide meetings, activities and events. Such awareness has impacted SBCC’s activity in the Americans with Disabilities Act compliance and made us recipients of the Santa Barbara Mayor’s “Outstanding Effort” award and the “No Place for Hate” award from the Anti-Defamation League.

Under his leadership, the ASL Club won the 2009-2010 “Club of the Year Award”.

The numerous Deaf and ASL-related activities on campus and around the Santa Barbara community have motivated employees, students and community members to reassess their perception towards people who are Deaf. As a result of all the on-going activities, Deaf people are seen as a linguistic minority with their own social mores and values, rather than a disabled group, thereby promoting inclusion and increasing diversity.

**Dr. Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson:** Dr. Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson has been chair of the Equity Committee since 2005 and is also the Associate Vice President for Instruction at American River College (ARC). She was also the Dean of Humanities. Prior to coming to ARC, Lisa spent 12 years as a community college teacher in Washington where she earned tenure and
taught composition, literature, and humanities courses. She also served as the Student Services Program Administrator for the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. Recently in the Sacramento Region, Lisa has participated in the Metro Chamber of Commerce Leadership Sacramento Program and as a member of the Global Village Planning Committee. Lisa attended ARC in 1987-1988 and transferred to the University of Puget Sound for her BA, English. She received her MA, English from Western Washington University. In 2008, she earned a Ph.D. in Education, Emphasis on Community College Leadership, from Oregon State University. Some of her highlighted accomplishments for diversity or equity are:

- Created the Community and Diversity Center, a safe place for all, especially those from underrepresented groups. Since then, the committee has been one of the most active and effective standing committees on campus.

- Created Multicultural Week, a campus-wide event that brings the students, faculty, and staff to celebrate diversity together.

- Created Diversity Panel at the ARC spring 2008 convocation, a presentation to the campus community at which faculty and staff members candidly spoke about their personal experiences as members of various underrepresented groups on campus and in the United States.

- Lisa designed and led a program on Cultural Competency Training for the Administrative Leadership Council. Highlights of the training have been two retreats and several panels addressing the needs of Eastern European, Muslim, Native American, Latina, African American, Asian American, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender, and deaf and hard-of-hearing cultures.

- Campus members who previously felt excluded due to their special needs, sexual orientation, ethnic backgrounds, and religious beliefs were more active in contributing to the advancement of diversity. That is, they were no longer invisible or silent members of the campus community.

- Improved greatly the student representatives’ participation on the college standing committees.

- She is a leader who takes action to ensure that all voices are heard and always sees room for enhancing diversity and works tirelessly to make sure that American River College truly welcomes all. She is a role model for everyone who strives for an inclusive community.

**The Veterans Support Program:** The Veterans Support Program (VSP) at Santa Barbara City College is a comprehensive support program that assists veterans and dependents of veterans who are eligible to receive educational benefits. In the 2010-2011 academic year,
there were 195 students who participated in the VSP. The VSP has one full-time Student Program Advisor, and four part-time VA student workers. This program, under the exceptional and outstanding leadership of Ms. Magdalena Torres since 1974, has flourished to be a very important and respected program at Santa Barbara City College. The staff assesses, plans, implements, coordinates, monitors, and evaluates the student’s progress toward his or her educational goal attainment. The veteran student who is not making regular progress receives e-mail correspondence as well as regular mail and telephone calls with a referral to the VSP. After the assessment process, the Veterans Support Program (VSP) refers each student to any of the support services on the Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) campus such as tutorial centers, personal development courses or student success counseling. If appropriate, the VSP makes referrals to off-campus Veterans Affairs agencies and local social service organizations. This individualized student-centered approach exemplifies the quality of the VSP. Some of their highlighted accomplishments for diversity or equity are:

The Veterans Support Program promotes diversity and equity by raising awareness and appreciation for the unwavering dedication at SBCC for the veteran student. SBCC hosts numerous events in their honor on a yearly basis. This includes, but is not limited to, Veterans Appreciation Week, Veterans Resource Day and California Military Women’s Week. These events utilize films, community speakers, student speakers, and California military personnel in celebrating the contributions of veterans to national security. These events promote awareness, acceptance, and honoring of veteran students from diverse backgrounds (gender, ethnicity, disability, etc). Of the 195 veteran students participating in the Veterans Support Program, 35 percent are underrepresented.

In October 2010, the Military Times EDGE magazine recognized SBCC as one of the top 101 “Best for Vet” colleges and universities in the United States. It cited SBCC for its excellent student services, financial aid, academic policies and supportive campus culture. Of equal importance, it acknowledged the dedication at SBCC to assist veterans in making a successful transition from military life to college life.

A significant number of students have successfully transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, Santa Barbara, Davis, Los Angeles, Columbia University and University of Southern California. Approximately 12 students transferred at the end of Spring 2010.

Each term Veterans participate in our SBCC Study Abroad Program studying in countries such as France, Italy, Chile, Argentina, China, Vietnam and Spain.

Several of our veteran students have been selected to participate in the University of California at Santa Barbara Summer Internships in Nanosystems Science, Engineering and Technology program.

SBCC changed its transfer credit policy to allow veteran students to receive up to 24 college credits from military training and experience. This change in policy allowed SBCC
to join a consortium of accredited colleges and universities to provide educational opportunities for service members. It joins the ranks of military-friendly institutions with flexible policies that allow military service members and their families to complete degrees.

The VSP has made a measurable impact on employees, students and the community by increasing awareness of issues faced by veterans, sacrifices made by veterans and their families, and resources available to veterans. The VSP provides a measurable impact in assisting veteran students and their dependents to reach their academic goals. Its impact is much broader than that, this program serves to educate the entire college community in a measurable and meaningful way.

Conclusion

The Board of Governors, Foundation for California Community Colleges, Mrs. Clara Rice, dignitaries, and guests will gather to honor former Board member Dr. John W. Rice and recognize the following 11th annual awardees: Mr. Ignacio Ponce, Dr. Lisa Lawrenson, and The Veterans Support Program under the leadership of Ms. Magdalena Torres.

Staff: Tosh Shikasho, Retired Specialist for Equal Employment Opportunity
RESOLUTION

SPECIAL PRESENTATION
Presentation: Scott Himelstein, President, Board of Governors

Item 1.2

Issue

This item presents a resolution to former Board member Robert V. “Bobby” McDonald.
RESOLUTION

Commending

Robert “Bobby” V. McDonald

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald has served as a member of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors since 2007; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald was a member of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors Veterans Committee and was a strong advocate for veterans services at all 112 community college campuses; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald has been a key contributor to the “Honor a Hero, Hire a Vet” program; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald is the president and executive director of the Black Chamber of Commerce of Orange County which under his leadership, partnered with minority business associations, local chambers, and legislators to provide support for the county's many small-business owners; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald developed the Black Chamber of Commerce of Orange County's educational outreach program, Bricks and Bridges, and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship Program with Christ Our Redeemer AME Church in Irvine; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald is a founder of the Orange County President's Council; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald is a founding member of the Orange County Sports Hall of Fame; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald is the chair of the Anaheim's Housing and Community Development Commission and the Orange County Sheriff's Community Coalition; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald has been given the Distinguished Alumnus Award from California State University, Fullerton where he is a former president of the Cal State Fullerton Alumni Foundation; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald has served on the statewide California State University Alumni Council; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald is a former student body president at Los Angeles Harbor College; and

Whereas, Robert V. McDonald has served his country with the United State Navy and is a Vietnam veteran; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, On July 11, 2011, that the members of the Board of Governors and the California Community Colleges Chancellor Jack Scott sincerely thank Robert V. McDonald for his dedication, leadership and vision, and commend him for the many contributions he has made to the California Community Colleges; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board warmly extends to Robert V. McDonald its wish for continued success in all of his future personal, professional, civic and educational endeavors.
RESOLUTION

SPECIAL PRESENTATION
Presentation: Scott Himelstein, President, Board of Governors

Item 1.3

Issue

In March 2011, Dr. Norman Levin generously gave nearly $14 million to Bakersfield College, the single largest donation ever given to a community college in U.S. history. Prior to that, Dr. Levan donated $5.7 million to the campus in 2006. At the time, that had been the largest donation given to a California community college on record. The two gifts combined bring Dr. Levan’s overall donation to Bakersfield College to nearly $20 million, $10 million higher than any other gift from an individual on record.

Dr. Levan’s most recent gift is designated to build the Norman Levan Scholarship Endowment that will award $500,000 annually to 250 students to cover fees, books and part of their living expenses for the year. Almost $700,000 of the $14 million donation will be used to create a scholarship endowment specifically for students interested in studying Hispanic and Native American cultures. His generosity will provide educational opportunities to thousands of students and will benefit the Central Valley for years to come.

Dr. Levan’s 2006 donation to Bakersfield College was used to create the Norman Levan Center for the Humanities; the Levan Lifelong Learning Institute that offers classes to area residents; the Norman Levan Scholarship Endowment and a separate donation to create the Norman Levan Humanities Essay Scholarship.

In these difficult economic times, charitable donations to California’s community colleges are more important than ever. Members of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors and Chancellor Scott want to recognize Dr. Levan through a Board of Governors Resolution for his exceptionally generous contribution that will help make higher education accessible for thousands of Californians. Dr. Levan’s gift will provide support and assistance to community college students who need it the most.
RESOLUTION

Commending

Dr. Norman Levan

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan made an incredibly generous donation of nearly $14 million to Bakersfield College in March 2011, the single largest donation ever to a community college in the nation’s history; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan’s gracious gift will build the Norman Levan Scholarship Endowment that will award $500,000 annually to 250 students to cover fees, books and partial living expenses for the year; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan’s donation also includes $665,000 annually in scholarships specifically for students with interest in studying Hispanic and Native American cultures; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan has already made a generous $5.7 million donation to Bakersfield College in 2006 to create the Norman Levan Center for the Humanities, the Levan Lifelong Learning Institute that offers lifelong learning classes to area residents, and the Norman Levan Scholarship Endowment; and a separate donation to create the Norman Levan Humanities Essay Scholarship; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan is professor emeritus and former chief of dermatology at the University of Southern California Keck School of Medicine; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan endowed the University of Southern California Levan Institute for Humanities and Ethics in 2007 and the Norman E. Levan Chair in Medical Ethics at the University of Southern California’s Keck School of Medicine in 2010; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan ably served as a medical officer in the United States Army during World War II and participated in the battle of Okinawa, one of the fiercest fights of that war; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan established the Hansens Disease Clinic for leprosy at the Los Angeles County/USC Medical Center in 1962 at the request of state and federal health officials; and

Whereas, Dr. Norman Levan, at age 95, continues to see elderly and patients with special cases at his Bakersfield medical office; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors and California Community Colleges Chancellor Jack Scott thank Dr. Norman Levan for his dedicated service to the community at large and his benevolence toward Bakersfield College that will help students in need reach their educational goals for generations.
CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

SPECIAL PRESENTATION
Presentation:    Jack Scott, Chancellor, California Community Colleges

Item 1.4

Issue

This item presents a certificate of appreciation to Stephanie Puentes, Executive Fellow in the Governmental Relations Division at the Chancellor’s Office.
May 9, 2011

Call to Order
Board of Governors President, Scott Himelstein, called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

Item 1 Consent Calendar

Item 1.1 Approval of the Minutes
This item requested Board approval of the March 7-8, 2011, Board meeting minutes.

Board vice president Alice Perez motion for approval of the March 2011 Board meeting minutes. Board member Gary Reed seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Item 1.2 Approval of Contracts and Grants
This item was removed from the consent calendar.

President’s Report
President Scott Himelstein:

Attended the White House Summit on community colleges in San Diego on April 15, 2011.

Attended the joint meeting of the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and Chief Executive Officers (CEO) boards in San Diego.

Chancellor’s Report Continues
Chancellor Jack Scott:

Attended the joint meeting of the CCCT and CEO boards in San Diego.

Will be speaking at four graduations.

Attended the White House Summit on community colleges in San Diego on April 15, 2011.
Chancellor’s Report Continues

Spoke about the appointments of Henry Ramos, Peter MacDougall and Deborah Malumed and Governor Brown’s Executive Order on Travel

Met with the Department of Finance with Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner and Vice Chancellor Dan Troy.

The Student Success Task Force will be meeting on Wednesday, May 9. He is encouraged by the work of the task force.

Item 2 Action

Item 2.1 Amendments to the 2011-12 Career and Technical Education Improvement Act Expenditure Plan

Presented by: José Millan

The amendments presented in this item represent a contingency plan in anticipation of reduction to federal Perkins funding. Tech Prep (Title II) funding which represents over $11 million will be eliminated and the Perkins Basic State Grant (Title I) will be reduced however the actual amount of the reduction is currently unknown as the Chancellor’s Office has not received notification of its share of Perkins funding from the California Department of Education.

The recommended amendments to Title I:
- Fully funding advisory committees;
- Funding regional consortia at 90 percent of the full funding level; and,
- Funding statewide collaborative at 80 percent of the full funding level

The recommended amendments to Title II:
- Use the ten percent reserve fund over the next year to refocus the tech prep program into STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) program support.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Tanna Thomas: At the joint meeting of the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education in July 2010 we talked about working together on Career Technical Education, has there been any progress in that area? Also the Joint Advisory Committee on Career Technical Education hasn’t met in awhile, has there been any discussion on when the next meeting will take place?

There has been discussion but no meeting has been scheduled at this time.

President Himelstein stated that he’s had discussion with the State Board of Education and will report on those discussions during board member reports.
Board President Scott Himelstein: What is the statewide collaborative?
The statewide collaboratives are community colleges and local school districts that work on developing Career Technical Education programs within their regions.

Board member Gary Reed motioned for the Board to approve the recommended action on this item. Board member Isabel Barreras seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments
Tanna Thomas, Scott Himelstein

Item 2.2 Title 5 Regulations: Proposed Revisions to the Conflict of Interest Code of the Board of Governors
Presented by: Steve Bruckman
The Board was asked to approval minor technical changes to the title 5 regulations on the conflict of interest code.

Board Vice President Alice Perez motioned for the Board to approve the recommended action on this item. Board member Lance Izumi seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Item 3 First Reading

Item 3.1 Proposed Amendment to Board of Governors Standing Order, Chapter 3, Article 333- Student Senate
Presented by: Linda Michalowski and Sonia Ortiz-Mercado
At the November 2010 meeting, members of the Board raised concerns about the Student Senate and how the organization operates. As a result of those concerns the Chancellor’s Office reviewed the Standing Orders related to the student senate. The recommended amendments will provide more clarity on the role of the Chancellor’s Office as it relates to the operation of the Student Senate.

The amendment to the Standing Orders will address verification of student eligibility to serve on the student senate, establish minimum standards of conduct and establish the Chancellor’s Office as the administrative arm of the Board in providing support and ensuring the integrity of the Student Senate. The amendments will also include a process of reviewing and responding to concerns about the Student Senate.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Manuel Baca: Can you give me more information on the academic progress issues? Students serving on the student senate didn’t have academic eligibility. Some students would enroll in five units to meet participation requirements and then drop classes during the semester, and
students challenged the right of the Chancellor’s Office to notify the president and student senate council members of their ineligibility to serve on the council due to these circumstances. We were able to resolve these problems by having students certify at the beginning of their term that they will maintain eligibility and to authorize the disclosure of information should they lose eligibility.

Board Comments
Manuel Baca

Public Comments
Rachael Richards, Alex Pader

Item 3.2 Proposed Title 5 Change on Appointment Limit for Enrollment in Credit Courses (Sections 55024, 55040, 55042, 58161 and 58161.5)
Presented by: Linda Michalowski
This item is seeking to amend the number of times a district can receive apportionment funding for students who re-enroll in a course they have previously taken. The amendments would allow districts to receive appointment funding up to three times, with the exception of a fourth time for a student going through the appeals process.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Do you anticipate that local districts will need to do enrollment programming changes in order to implement this? Yes, programming changing will need to be made.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Does the implementation date of Spring 2012 allow enough time for district to make the necessary changes? I met with the admissions and records officers at their statewide conference and they generally felt that they would have time to put the changes into place by Spring 2012.

Board member Isabel Barreras: Would a documented catastrophic medical leave be considered an exception? Yes

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Would you talk a little more about the definition of outside of their control? In the withdrawal regulation (55024a), extenuating circumstances are verified cases of accidents, illnesses or other circumstances beyond the control of students. The language is quite broad and allows the colleges discretion.

Chancellor Scott spoke to the Board in support of this change. He stated that the system is rationing enrollment and although he doesn’t like to use that term it is happening. He stated this is an intelligent way to ration enrollment.
Board member Geoffrey Baum: How much of this is someone taking a class and passing it each time whether it be an art class, physical education or other? Of the five courses that are most often repeated, three of those are activity courses and the other two are math and English.

Board Geoffrey Baum: Are most people retaking the class because they enjoyed it or is it the people who don’t pass that are retaking it? Will this also limit the number of times someone can take a repeatable class? For the student who no longer qualifies for apportionment for an English or math class, can they enroll in another institution and start that cycle over again? If a student passes a non-repeatable course such as math or English with a C or better they cannot retake the course. If a student gets less than a C they have two opportunities to retake the course for a better grade. This will limit apportionment for repeatable classes. The system advisory committee on curriculum and the academic affairs division will be looking at the whole issue of repeatable courses and considering policy changes in that area. The student can enroll in another district and start the cycle over again.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Does this change cover every course in our curriculum? Yes, it covers every course in our curriculum.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is there a process in place for counselor to reach out to students who are repeating these courses? That is certainly the way that it should work and we’ve talked about interventions to help students when they don’t appear to be on the right track. But it’s very difficult to do that when our resources for counseling have been cut so deeply.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: I would suggest that these changes include a recommendation that colleges develop a system to reach out to students if they don’t already have one. In the existing policy the Board has already included that each district have a policy in place to address repeat/withdrawals.

Board Comments
Tanna Thomas, Isabel Barreras, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Geoffrey Baum, Alice Perez

Public Comments
Leslie Smith, Marc Valenzuela

Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.1 Update on the Activities of the Foundation for California Community Colleges
Presented by: Paul Lanning
Paul Lanning, President/CEO of the Foundation, spoke to the Board about the following Foundation activities:

The Chancellor’s Office legal division completed a policy analysis of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations and how they apply to allowing college foundations
access to alumni/student records. The legal opinion which states that Foundations can have access to student records if they go through certain steps was distributed to the college/district foundations.

The level of financial support that the Foundation provides to the Chancellor’s Office will remain the same for the coming fiscal year.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) contract was terminated by the California Department of Education. The Foundation has operated this program for the past several years.

Dr. Lanning Spoke about what’s next in regards to the capacity-building study funded by the Kresge Foundation.

Presented a slideshow on the Hands Across California event.

Board members had the following questions/comments and the panel responded.

Board President Scott Himelstein: Was the TANF contract set to expire or was it a budget cut? The contract is set to expire on June 30, 2011.

Board members congratulated Dr. Lanning on the Hands Across California event.

Board members Geoffrey Baum: Commented on the capacity building that has gone on over the past three years and how that will impact future fundraising efforts.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Are there foundations at the colleges that have raised nothing toward the Osher endowment? Do you have any understanding as to why they didn’t leap on this opportunity? Several of those colleges have foundations. There are several different explanations including lack of resources to focus on this, the idea that raising funds for scholarships is not the priority right now, etc.

Board member Gary Reed: Reminded the Board that when the Osher grant was given there was no money allocated for administrative expenses. Dr. Lanning and his staff have been able to generate this effort without any funding. He also stated that he attended a finance committee meeting with JP Morgan and they have done a great job of investing, a little over $4 million has been earned. He complimented Keetha Mills, Vice President of Finance/Chief Financial Officer, at the Foundation and the advisory board for the efforts they have made with JP Morgan.

Board Comments
Scott Himelstein, Peter MacDougall, Geoffrey Baum, Manuel Baca, Peter MacDougall, Benita Haley, Alice Perez, Gary Reed, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Isabel Barreras
Item 1 Action Calendar

Item 1.2 Approval of Contracts and Grants
Presented by: Steve Bruckman
This item requested Board approval of the contracts and grants as described in this item.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: How is the funding in grant 24 allocated, how much is used for coverage of Board meetings and what is the rest of it used for?

Board meetings represent approximately $25,000 of the grant. $1.5 million goes to CCC Confer which is the systemwide audio conferencing services. The rest of the grant represents a consolidation of projects.

Board member Lance Izumi motion for the Board to approval the recommended action on this item. Board Vice President Alice Perez seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments:
Geoffrey Baum

Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.2 State Budget Update
Presented by: Dan Troy (Handout)
Vice Chancellor Dan Troy updated the Board on the state budget.

1. The budget proposal for community colleges include a $400 million base reduction, student fees have been increased to $36 per unit and a new deferral of $129 million has been approved.

2. The May revision will be released on May 16th. There is indication that revenues are running higher than estimated.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Gary Reed: As colleges use up their reserves do they turn to this agency for direction in terms of managing their budget?

We do monitor district budgets. We try to keep tabs on the amount of reserves they have. The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team can also help districts.

Board Comments
Gary Reed
Item 4.4  Update on the Implementation of SB 1440: Student Transfer  
*Presented by: Linda Michalowski and Jane Patton (PowerPoint)*

Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski and Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, updated the Board on the implementation of Senate Bill 1440.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski provide background information on SB 1440. She also discussed the names of the SB 1440 degrees, benefits to students and some of the challenges that SB 1440 students may face.

President Patton provided a complete overview of the transfer model curriculum process to the Board.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski also reported that 15 degrees based on the completed TMCs have been approved and College of the Desert is the first community college in the state to create an associate degree for transfer. A website that will be primarily used by internal audiences in the two systems is being developed and it should be live in the next few weeks.

*Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.*

Board member Lance Izumi: Have there been any major challenges or differences in this process?  
I feel very good about the faculty-to-faculty dialogue. There are challenges, but so far everyone is working together to get through them.

Board member Deborah Malumed: When you have a college that tells you they are not going to accept your plan do you go back and change it?  
All of the TMCs will be reviewed on a regular basis and yes we can revisit and make changes.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is it possible for each of the colleges to have different programs for obtaining the degrees?  
Senate Bill 1440 did not require alignment. Technically 112 colleges could offer 112 degrees. We are trying to encourage uniformity as much as possible with some local flexibility.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is there a timeline that we are pushing towards for having all of the campuses offering degrees?  
The law said by fall the colleges need to be offering degrees but it didn’t stipulate how many. The Chancellor’s Office has asked district to have two degrees in place by fall 2011.
Board member Peter MacDougall: Are we adhering to a ratio that enlarges the upper division ratio to ensure an opportunity is going to be available for our students? The 40/60 ratio is in law and California State University (CSU) continues to honor that in its approach to enrollment management. From the beginning the CSU has said if necessary they will decrease the number of freshmen enrollments in order to make sure that community college transfer students that have these degrees will have a slot. The tricky part is that entitlement is only to somewhere in the CSU system. That is not necessarily a guarantee that every transfer student that is well qualified will be able to get into the CSU of their choice.

Board member Isabel Barreras: There is a subcommittee in place to develop information and tools for the counselors at transfer centers, what type of tools will they be using and is degree audit one they will be able to use? We have just started the process of putting that subcommittee together. I don’t have an answer for what the tools are going to be, the first task for this group will be to determine what is needed.

Board member Henry Ramos: On the bottom of your PowerPoint slide can you explain what you mean by budget cuts could reduce or eliminate spring 2012 transfers. During the last round of budget cuts for higher education, the CSU Chancellor’s Office offered guidance to the campuses about their enrollment targets. If you look at our annual transfer numbers to CSU from two years ago they plummeted by more than 10,000 enrollments because CSU got late news that their budget was being cut so the determination was that all of those cuts would occur in the spring term and almost all of their enrollments in the spring term are community college transfer students.

Board members thanked Vice Chancellor Michalowski and Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, for the work they have done and thanked Mrs. Patton for her work as president of the Academic Senate.

Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, announced that Michelle Pilati will be the new Academic Senate President and Beth Smith will be the Vice President. Beth Smith is currently the co-chair of the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum.

**Board Comments**
Lance Izumi, Deborah Malumed, Alice Perez, Peter MacDougall, Benita Haley, Isabel Barreras, Henry Ramos, Manuel Baca, Barbara Davis-Lyman

**Item 4.6 Board Goals Update**
*Presented by: Scott Himelstein*
Board President Scott Himelstein updated the Board on their goals. He stated that he has spoken to Mike Kirst, President of the State Board of Education, and the two boards will not be able to meet this year. The board will also need to add someone to the veterans committee.
Board members had the following questions/comments and President Himelstein responded.

Board member Henry Ramos: Can we look at specific outcomes we would like to see in these areas? At our retreat we focused on specific areas. With the State Board of Education we focused on concurrent enrollment and career and technical education and with veterans we focused on a database and earmarked funding to provide more programmatic options for veterans.

Board member Gary Reed: Regarding advocacy efforts with elected officials I would suggest that working with Vice Chancellor Garcia, Board members have a specific task and an agenda so we have better communication with our Assemblymembers and Senators.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Would like to request that the Board begins to increase its understanding of what is happening to the system as a result of these years of budgetary decline. Would also like to suggest that the Board set aside time in their meeting to look at what is taking place in the area of student success and how we are increasing the viability of our colleges in this area. I would have to defer to the Chancellor to see if we have the capacity to do an in-depth look at what the past four years have meant on a systemwide basis.

Chancellor Scott: Here’s what happened. Classified staff has been reduced; we have fewer administrators per 100 students than we did three to four years ago; we have largely cut part-time faculty; and, as full-time faculty retire they have not been replaced. The real infrastructure of student services has probably been the hardest hit of all the elements of community colleges. Community colleges around the state will be operating at about 95 percent of their capacity next year at the best and possibility 90 percent if there is an all cuts budget. If the Board would like speakers or a report on the impact of cuts on our colleges we can provide that.

President Himelstein summarized the suggestions the Board requested:

The Board would like a report on the deterioration of the system over the past 3-4 years.

The Board would like to invite Mike Kirst, President and Sue Burr, Executive Director, of the State Board of Education to speak at an upcoming Board meeting.

The Board would like presentations on what is working in our system.

The Board would like Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia to set up advocacy meetings for Tuesday afternoons.

Board Comments
Henry Ramos, Gary Reed, Peter MacDougall, Deborah Malumed, Alice Perez, Manuel Baca, Lance Izumi, Isabel Barreras
Item 4.7 Board Committees

Presented by: Alice Perez

Board Vice President Alice Perez asked Board member to give the name of the committees they preferred to serve on.

Board President Scott Himelstein reported that he asked Board Vice President Alice Perez to work with Board member Michelle Price on the Student Affairs committee.

Public Forum

Jonathan Lightman, with the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), spoke to the Board about the budget and expressed gratitude for the work of Vice Chancellor Dan Troy. He also spoke about advocating with business partners, increasing their presence on in the blogosphere, and expressed disappointment over Robert “Bobby” McDonald not being re-appointed to the Board. FACCC is working with Board member Manuel Baca and staff at the Chancellor’s Office on the idea of a veteran’s conference in the fall.

Will Bruce, California Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Association, announced that Allen Hancock College (home of the largest Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) program in the state of California) is having a grand opening for the very first CARE center in the state of California, the center was established with private donations, and no state program funds were used for the center.

New Business

No new business was discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. by Board President Scott Himelstein.
May 10, 2011

Call to Order
Board of Governors President, Scott Himelstein, called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

Item 5 Special Presentation

Item 5.1  2010 Classified Employee of the Year Awards
Presented by: Tanna Thomas, Scott Himelstein, Jack Scott and Christopher Joyce

The following individuals received 2011 Classified Employee of the Year Awards:

- *Trisha Albertsen, Chaffey Community College District*
- *Dottie Arcangeli, Feather River Community College District*
- *Stephanie Alves, Contra Costa Community College District*
- *Susan Monahan, West-Valley Mission Community College District*
- *Christie Boggs, Butte-Glenn Community College District*
- *Barbara Cogert, Ventura County Community College District, not able to attend.*

Item 5.3  Excellence in Technology Leadership Award
Presented by: Patrick Perry
James “Jim” Dolgonas, of the CENIC Corporation was presented with the Excellence in Technology Leadership Award.
Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.3 State and Federal Update

Presented by: Marlene Garcia

Board President Scott Himelstein thanked Vice Chancellor Garcia for a great job with the legislative reception.

Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia provided an update on state legislative activities.

State Update

The Legislature is dealing with some tough policy issues driven by the fiscal environment, the demand for community college education and a desire to help bring more access to students.

Key Bills

AB 515 (Brownley) Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges – This bill authorizes the governing board of any community college district, without approval of the Board of Governors, to establish and maintain an extension program offering credit courses. Recent amendments clarify that: 1) California Community College (CCC) district governing boards are prohibited from expending General Fund moneys to establish and maintain extension courses; 2) CCC district governing boards are allowed to charge students enrolled in extension classes such fees as they deem appropriate; 3) the program shall be subject to district collective bargaining agreements; 4) program enrollment shall be open to the public; 5) extension credit courses shall not supplant courses funded with state apportionment; and, 6) degree credit courses offered as extension courses are required to meet all of the requirements of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, which governs the development and approval of new curriculum for CCC credit courses.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that there were in depth discussion in the policy committee on the potential ramifications of going in this direction. She also feels that Assembly member Brownley is interested in talking with community college leaders.

Vice Chancellor Garcia also reported that this bill is sponsored by Santa Monica Community College and the College of the Canyons but is facing a lot of opposition particularly from faculty groups.

Some of the issues with this legislation include:

The fee structure – how will it work and how would it be set.

Financial Aid – will these students have access to financial aid and is there some equity protection embedded in this type of proposal.

What should be the focus of the content that is provided in this kind of extension program?
Governance – who will approve this and ensure that colleges are equipped to move in this direction.

**AB 1315 (Furutani)** – This bill would establish Gateway Centers as model programs that provide adult learners’ basic skill educational opportunities that more readily lead to completion of a college occupational certificate. This bill is in response to the decline in K-12 funding for adult education given recent statutory changes allowing the Legislative Analyst Office authority to use adult education funding for any educational purpose. As a result, there has already been a steep decline in funding for adult education programs. This bill is a work in progress and is attempting to determine whether there is a way to leverage workforce resources to better serve adult learners.

Vice Chancellor Garcia thinks this bill in its current form needs a lot of work but feel the author would be willing to work with the system.

**AB 160 (Portantino) Concurrent Enrollment in Secondary School and Community College** – This bill would make several changes to existing law regarding concurrent enrollment. The bill:
1) allows a school district to enter into a partnership with a community college district to determine local concurrent enrollment policies for high school students;
2) permits a high school student to concurrently enroll in a community college during any session or term upon notification of the high school principal; current law requires the student to seek permission from the principal before concurrently enrolling in a community college. A student can exercise this opportunity only when all other options to enroll in an equivalent course at their local high school have been exhausted;
3) repeals the summer 5 percent cap on K-12 concurrent enrollment, along with related requirements and exemptions in current law; and,
4) strikes existing law assigning low priority to concurrent enrollment students to ensure that regularly admitted students are not displaced and replaces this with language that prohibits a community college district from assigning any enrollment priority to these students.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that the system has been in a lot of discussions with the author and that the author has amended the bill to allow local community college districts working in a partnership with K-12 districts the ability to relax some of the restrictions. The author is going to continue to allow students outside of the partnership to notify the high school principal if they are enrolling in concurrent enrollment instead of getting permission from the principal, because of this the Board/Chancellor’s Office has not taken a support position on this legislation.

Chancellor Scott spoke to the board and stated that we are in a time where we have to ration our education. He stated that community colleges would like to help but there comes a time when colleges have to let the legislature know that we can’t do all of this because we don’t want to crowd out the functions in our colleges that we consider our primary task.
Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I concur with what the Chancellor has said, but I’d like to offer a slightly modified perspective. I think there is universal support for the intent of the bill but it is lacking the financial capability to implement it. I would like to see a position of supporting but highly modifying expectations.

Board member Manuel Baca: Agrees with what the Chancellor said. We’ve received data that shows high school graduates are not getting into community colleges because they are the last in line to register. It does seem that concurrent enrollment could help with prioritizing registration as they graduate.

Board President Scott Himelstein: I’m very supportive of concurrent enrollment and I agree with member MacDougall. If this bill was to pass in its current form, local district still make the decisions in terms of priorities with the exception of priorities that are mandated by state law. So even if it passed and we supported it, it doesn’t mandate that there be more concurrent enrollment. Is that correct?
Correct. Current law prohibits giving concurrent enrollment students higher priority. This legislation would give them (colleges/districts) the opportunity to change that when they are in partnership with a K-12 district.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Is this similar to the prerequisite policy we passed, that it was up to local control?
The part of the bill that says you can relax your enrollment requirements if you are in a relationship with a K-12 district would give the local districts the authority. The principal provision is outside of that.

Board President Scott Himelstein: Chancellor, do you see that particular provision as being a competitive pressure on the locals that you would be opposed to?
I don’t know that I oppose it. I’m probably more deeply concerned about older adults taking enrichment courses. I find colleges moving in that direction. In the next legislative session there may be a bill that deals with priority registration because sometimes I think the local colleges need their hands strengthened on this issue.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: We serve a diverse population and I think if we can help those students get enrolled into our colleges and advance themselves sooner, we should be supportive of that as long as we get the funding to help do that.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I think we should remind ourselves that this is not a mandate. This is an opportunity to change and allow for greater flexibility. I have tremendous confidence in the local districts ability to manage this so that it does not become a conflict.
Board President Scott Himelstein: I tend to be supportive of this with one caveat, this issues of receiving permission and us not knowing what the impact would be. I’m sensing a desire to support from the Board, however I know there are always good reason for the positions you recommend. It would be helpful for the board if you can provide us with more information on this issue.

Thank you for this robust policy discussion. This issue has taken the form that it has because of the fiscal environment we’re in. I think the provision that says concurrent enrollment should be done as a partnership is a significant improvement in the policy. The issue is, should any student outside of the partnership be allowed to decide whether they should be taking concurrent enrollment classes. That is the reason we did not support it. I will be happy to come back with more information on the impact of the permission provision of the legislation.

**AB 684 (Block) Community College Districts: Trustee Elections** – This bill would allow community college districts that wish to switch from at-large trustee elections to trustee area elections to do so via a waiver process. The waiver would be approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

This bill is sponsored by the Community College League of California.

Bonnie Slosson, Director of Government Relations for the Community College League of California, spoke about AB 684.

*Board Comments*
Peter MacDougall, Manuel Baca, Scott Himelstein, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Alice Perez, Deborah Malumed

*Public Comments*
Jonathan Lightman, Jane Patton, Leslie Smith, Alex Pader

**Item 5 Special Presentation**

**Item 5.4 Federal Update with Jee Hang Lee**

*Presented by: Jee Hang Lee (PowerPoint)*

Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia introduced Jee Hang Lee, Director of Public Policy for the Association of Community College Trustees, to the Board of Governors.

Jee Hang Lee thanked Chancellor Scott and Vice Chancellor Garcia for the invitation to speak before the Board of Governors. Mr. Lee’s PowerPoint presentation provided an overview of federal government issues including information on fiscal year 2011 appropriations, the budget for fiscal year 2012, the Pell grant program, WIA authorization, etc.
Board members had the following questions/comments and the speaker responded.

Board member Henry Ramos: Do you think not unlike the period after the end of the cold war, there might be something like a peace dividend that could create a different kind of sensibility about how we budget particularly around education with California as a leader and our leadership in the higher education field, sort of helping to advance that discussion. Is this something not foreseeable in the future in your judgment?
We have a number of candidates that have expressed interest in demolishing the Department of Education at the federal level. I just noted the problems we are having with Pell and the cost of Pell. I have hopes something like that might occur but I don’t really foresee it.

Board Comments
Henry Ramos

Public Comments
Valerie Purnell

Item 4.5  Bi-Annual Report on Distance Education
*Presented by: Barry Russell and LeBaron Woodyard (PowerPoint)*
Vice Chancellor Barry Russell and Dean LeBaron Woodyard presented a PowerPoint on distance education in the community college system. The distance education (DE) presentation included information on different forms of DE, the impact of the state budget on DE, DE student retention issues and strategies, DE recommendations from staff, etc.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Lance Izumi: In your opinion, has the increase in distance learning over the years contributed to the issue of impacted courses that we have seen across the system? Secondly when you cite the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) study, which talks about cost savings in terms of facilities, they seem to be focusing on the prospective cost of facilities in the future and the need for them if there is a large increase in distance learning, I would like to know your comments about that.
As far as the impact issue, as colleges do enrollment managements it is very important for campuses to continue to have discussions among themselves about the proper class size and methodology that is being used. I think the challenge is, where you might be restricted in a classroom setting to 25 seats, in an online setting you don't have that same restriction and the temptation maybe to try to push the increased enrollment into distance education on the back of faculty who are teaching distance education classes.
As far as the LAO issue, I think some of that discussion is targeted not necessarily to community colleges but to the University of California and California State University. I do think these things go hand in hand and we need to be careful about how we push them out into the future.
Board member Geoffrey Baum: Which recommendations require legislative action and which can go through our coordinating bodies?
Recommendation number one would require legislative action. Number two would require more money. Many of the others are more internal activities that we can deal with as a system.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: So that process would be that you would work through the Consultation Council and ultimately bring something back to the Board for action?
We would work through our coordinating bodies and bring it back to the Board if it required action.

Board member Tanna Thomas: What percentage of our distance education students are out of state or out of country?
We haven’t asked for that data.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Based on the comment about the possibility of licensure issues, I was wondering what the scope of that impact might be if colleges have to get a state license if they have students taking distance education courses in other states.
State authorization has sent ripples through the higher education community. Even though the Higher Education Act for 2008 was passed in August of 2009 and it wasn’t until October of 2010 that the whole state authorization issue came up and caught a lot of people off guard. It was supposed to be implemented as of July 1, 2011, but it caused such an uproar that 16 U.S. Senators signed a common letter to the U.S. Department of Education asking for some relief. A few weeks ago the U.S. Department of Education sent out a letter letting the field know they were giving colleges until July 1, 2012, to become compliant.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Thank you for the comprehensive report. There are several colleges out there that are very successful with this model of distance education and I would recommend to staff that when you are looking at these additional things, we also look at those models for best practices and analyze what they are doing compared to what we are doing. I would recommend that the Board support the recommendations that staff have presented.

Board member Henry Ramos: I am also a fan of looking at best practices and trying to bring them in when we can. Where would these retention strategies that have been identified align with the recommendations that are before us?
Recommendations one and two are very retention strategy oriented. We don’t provide the detail here but in some discussions we’ve talk about the feasibility of looking at a distance education technology fee and that fee would be used for retention efforts.

Board member Henry Ramos: I’m interested in these retention strategies being specifically attached to that kind of a general policy. To me that’s the combination that will insure that it’s not just framework that we are establishing for success but we are actually filling in that framework with something that the campuses are being incentivized to standardize across the system. These are things that need to be discussed in a broader context where these kinds of recommendations can get down to that level of detail. It wasn’t within our purview to go into details, but to allow the system the opportunity to have that discussion.
Board member Henry Ramos: If we can work with you to drill down on more concrete ways to take the general recommendations and turn them into practices that will likely lead to more success in this area, I think we will be better served.

Board member Lance Izumi: When looking at the report in which subjects is distance education more prone to be employed?
Patrick Perry: The top Full Time Equivalent Student generators for distance education are social sciences, business and management, humanities, information technology, and math.

Board Vice President Alice Perez motioned for the Board to endorse the staff recommendations that were presented in this report. Board member Lance Izumi seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

This item was not an action item.

Board Comments
Lance Izumi, Geoffrey Baum, Tanna Thomas, Alice Perez, Henry Ramos

Item 6.1 Board Member Reports

Lance Izumi

Thanked Board member Tanna Thomas for chairing the Classified Employee of the Year committee.

Threw out the first pitch at the Sacramento River Cats second home game of the season.

Barbara Davis-Lyman

Attended the California Connects event at American River College.

Attended the Community College League of California luncheon for Phi Beta Kappa with Board Vice President Alice Perez, where they presented the certificates.

Attended Intersegmental Lobby Day.

Thanked the governmental relations staff for putting together the Legislative Reception.

Attended the Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session.

Attended a ceremony at Sierra College where the new Science and Technology building was named after Kevin Ramirez.
Henry Ramos

Has continued to serve on the board of the Foundation for California Community Colleges and is working with Patricia Sullivan to evaluate this past year’s performance of the Foundation’s Chief Executive Officer (CEO). They are also working on a proposal to improve the process of evaluation for the CEO and other top level performers at the Foundation.

Continues to serve on the Cuesta College Foundation Board.

Thanked Chancellor Scott, members of the Board, Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner and Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia for all of their support and encouragement during the confirmation process.

Attended a meeting with Board member Peter MacDougall and vice chancellor Marlene Garcia with the Governor’s staff and the Senate Rules Committee. At the meeting, they discussed; transparency with executive compensation in the community college system, ethical contract compliance, and more active and early communication around any major policy issues that the system is hoping to move.

Manuel Baca

Congratulated the Classified Employee of the Year recipients.

Attended the Academic Senate Plenary Session.

Attended an accreditation seminar where he was a panelist for the discussion on the role of trustees and accreditation.

Attended a couple of events with Hilda Solis, Secretary for the Department of Labor, on jobs and the economy.

He reported that the Student Success Task Force is talking about several issues including performance based funding; assessment; and, late and priority registration.

He continues to work on ways that our system can assist veterans, and is currently working on a veteran’s conference with Faculty Association of California Community Colleges for September 2011 in San Diego.
Alice Perez

Attended the Community College League of California Phi Beta Kappa luncheon with Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman.

Attended the Student Senate General Assembly and participated in a roundtable discussion with Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski.

Attended Intersegmental Lobby Day.

Participated in Hands Across California at Sierra College

Scott Himelstein

Toured Palomar and Grossmont Colleges.

Will be giving the commencement address at Cuymaca College in June.

Geoffrey Baum

Participated in Hands Across California at Pasadena College.

Requested that videos from the Board meeting get posted to the web as soon as possible.

Had a meeting with Linda Wong and Estela Bensimon with the Center for Urban Education at University of Southern California. They wanted the Board and staff at the Chancellor’s Office to know that they are a resource for research and information about higher education policy.

Tanna Thomas

Thanked everyone who helped with the Classified Employee of the Year Awards.

Participated in Hands Across California at Woodland community college.

Benita Haley

Congratulated all of the Classified Employee of the Year recipients.

Thanked the Governmental Relations staff for their work on the Legislative Reception.
Deborah Malumed

Spoke at the registrar and admission officers’ conference.

Has been going through the appointments process.

Participated in Hands Across California at Long Beach City College.

Public Forum

Mark Valenzuela, Student Senate Representative – thanked Board Vice President Alice Perez and Board member Michelle Price for attending the Student Senate General Assembly. Also thanked the Board and the Chancellor’s Office for the wonderful experience he had being the Student Senate representative to the Board of Governors.

New Business

No new business was discussed at the meeting

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m. by Board of Governors President Scott Himelstein.
ITEM 2.2

Issue

This item presents contracts and grants for Board approval.

Background

The Board of Governors Procedures and Standing Orders (Sections 318 and 319) require the Chancellor to receive Board approval before entering into contracts or grants (or amendments of contracts or grants) which are:

- in excess of $100,000;
- over three years in duration; or
- with respect to consulting services, in excess of $50,000.

Analysis

For each Board meeting, staff prepares a summary of all currently proposed contracts and grants that exceed any of the Board established thresholds. If there are no proposed contracts or grants that exceed the established thresholds, the Board will be so informed at its meeting.

Recommended Action

That the Board of Governors approve entering into the contracts and grants described in the attached summary.
Contracts and Grants

The following are the summaries of contracts and grants that require Board approval pursuant to Standing Orders Nos. 318 and 319, copies of which are attached.

(1) Economic and Workforce Development Division
Reason for Board Approval: Grants Exceed $100,000
RFA Specification No.: 11-312
RFA Specification Title: Workplace Learning Resource Centers
Funding Source: Economic and Workforce Development
Type of Agreement: Grant
Total Amount Available Under RFA: $205,000
Total Number of Award Under RFA: One
Total Number of Awarded Under RFA: One
Grantee: TBD
Term: July 12, 2011 — June 30, 2012
Total Project Length: One to five years
Amount of Agreement: $205,000
Bid Process: Competitive
Number of Proposals Received: TBD
Number That Met Min. Score: TBD
Readers: External

Purpose: The Workplace Learning Resource Centers offer training solutions designed to meet the specific needs of employers, employees and prospective employees. Courses and programs focus on Workplace Basic Skills, Advanced Workplace Skills, English as a Second Language and Business Fundamentals. Projects offer Customized Training Solutions, Foundation Programs and Work Readiness and Skills Assessment. As part of a network of Centers and the California Community College System, they provide innovative and affordable training solutions, continuing education courses and certificate programs covering today’s most essential business topics.

(2) Economic and Workforce Development Division
Reason for Board Approval: Grants Exceed $100,000
RFA Specification No.: 10-315
RFA Specification Title: Statewide Strategic Initiative Hubs
Funding Source: Economic and Workforce Development
Type of Agreement: Grant
Term: July 1, 2010 — December 31, 2012
Total Project Length: Five Years
Bid Process: Renewal

Purpose: The purpose of the grant is for the centers hosting the hubs to help the system foster exploration of new initiatives and services delivery models by activities such as: acting as resource centers by housing best practices, grant information, and curriculum resources for colleges;
extending services into underserved geographic areas; and leading the network to identify businesses with the potential for domestic growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant No.</th>
<th>Grantee (District/College)</th>
<th>Original Award</th>
<th>Augmentation Amount</th>
<th>Total Grant Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-315-037</td>
<td>Los Rios CCD</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>$159,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Economic and Workforce Development Division

Reason for Board Approval: Contract Exceed $100,000
Type of Agreement: Contract (Interagency Agreement)
Contract No.: 11-REC-11
Contractor or Grantee: Employment Development Department
Total Award Amount: $3,000,000
Term: January 1, 2011 — June 30 2012
Total Project Length: 18 Months
Bid Process: N/A for Interagency Agreements

Purpose: The purpose of this action is to initiate this new Program Year 2010-11 subgrant agreement for the Nurses Education Initiative Phase II Project.

(4) Student Services Division

Reason for Board Approval: Contract Total Exceeds $100,000
Type of Agreement: Contact (DSPS/Outgoing Funds)
Contractor or Grantee: Santa Clarita CCD
Contract or Grant No.: 08-0346
Term: July 1 2011 – June 30, 2012
Total Project Length: Up to five years
Project Year: 4th year
Amount of Agreement:
Year 1: $780,000
Year 2: $655,200
Year 3: $500,000
Year 4: Up to $780,000

Actual project amount will be determined by the Chancellor’s Office and is subject to change depending on the availability of funding and authorized and budgeted amounts for DSPS categorical program and COLA.

Bid Process: Originally awarded through RFA competitive bid

Purpose: Provide funding for live and off-line captioning and transcription services to ensure the accessible delivery of distance education courses.
(5) Executive Division
Reason for Board Approval: Contract Total Exceeds $100,000
Type of Agreement: Contract (Executive/Outgoing funds)
Contractor or Grantee: West Valley-Mission CCD
Contract or Grant No.: 10-0021
Term:
Total Project Length: 24 months
Amount of Agreement:
Original: $220,000
Am. 1: $200,000

Purpose: It is West Valley College’s overall intent during the life of this contract to: (1) Coordinate two major exercises at colleges to be determined, (2) deliver three emergency operations center section chief training courses, (3) make 10 site visits to advise on and support emergency operation plans and risk assessments, (4) support the delivery of two active shooter workshops, (5) produce 10-15 podcasts on relevant emergency management subjects, (6) add significant content to the Disaster Resistant California Community Colleges website to be determined by the State Task Force, and (7) support the Disaster Resistant California Colleges Project in projects relating to School Safety Month, the Great Shakeout, and Golden Guardian 2012.

(6) Executive Division
Reason for Board Approval: Contract Total Exceeds $100,000
Type of Agreement: Contract (Exec/Outgoing funds)
Contractor or Grantee: Foundation for California Community Colleges
Contract or Grant No.: 10-0022
Term:
Original Term: July 19, 2010 – June 19, 2011
Am. 1: July 19, 2010 – June 30, 2011
Am. 2: July 19, 2010 – June 30, 2012
Total Project Length: 24 months
Amount of Agreement: $191,750
Bid Process: N/A

Purpose: The Foundation for California Community Colleges has been a critical partner of the Chancellor’s Office emergency preparedness effort by coordinating contract support staff, the Disaster Resistant California Community Colleges Task Force, and planning and training workshops for emergency management. The Foundation will continue this role in fiscal year 2011-12.
318. Contracts.
   (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), whenever the power to contract is invested in the Board, or when, in the judgment of the Chancellor, such contracts are expressly or impliedly authorized to fulfill responsibilities or authorities vested in the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor is authorized in the name of the Board of Governors to enter into such contracts.
   (b) The Chancellor shall secure Board approval before entering into any contract:
       (1) In excess of $100,000; or
       (2) Over three years in duration; or
       (3) With respect to consulting services, in excess of $50,000.
   The requirement for Board approval shall apply to any amendment of a contract which results in the original contract exceeding the specified limits, as well as the amendment of a contract where the amendment itself exceeds the specified limits. Under circumstances when the need to contract was not foreseeable, and when delaying approval of the contract until the next Board meeting would jeopardize the contract or frustrate its purpose, the Chancellor shall have the authority to enter into contracts in excess of the limits specified in this subsection. Before entering into such contracts, however, the Chancellor shall consult with the President of the Board.
   (c) In securing the approval of contracts by the Board pursuant to subsection (b), the Chancellor shall apply the following procedures:
       (1) In determining the nature, extent and need for any such contract, the Chancellor shall provide a summary of the Request for Proposal (RFP), Invitation for Bid (IFB), or other summary of the purpose and need for a contract to the Board of Governors prior to publicly releasing any such RFP or IFB, or prior to making any informal commitment to contract. The Chancellor may proceed with the release of the RFP, IFB, or other contract negotiations, unless the Board President, with or without the advice of any appropriate Board Committee designated by the President, directs the Chancellor to withhold action within a 10 day period from the date the summary is provided.
       (2) In developing language for such contracts, the Chancellor shall include a provision which allows any aggrieved bidder on an RFP or IFB to protest the awarding of a contract to the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall inform the Board of any such protests, including the results of such protests. This remedy shall be in addition to the bidder’s right to protest the matter to the Department of General Services.
       (3) The Chancellor shall ensure that each panel of evaluators who score proposals is made up of staff from more than one division in the Chancellor’s Office, including outside evaluators as appropriate; and the Chancellor shall take such other steps as necessary to ensure that evaluations and scoring are objective and fair.
       (4) In requesting approval of said contracts, the Chancellor shall, at the time of distributing each regular meeting agenda to the Board of Governors, include a summary of contracts for Board approval. The summary for each contract shall indicate: the purpose of the contract; the amount of the contract; the time for performance of the contract, including whether it was advertised as a multi-year contract; the number of proposals received or whether the contract
is a sole source contract; the number of proposals which met the minimum score for cost opening; and the party awarded the contract.

The provisions of subparagraphs (1) through (3) above shall not apply to interagency agreements with other state agencies, and other agreements necessary for the agency to receive public funds.

(d) The authorization contained in subsection (a) includes agreements, leases, contracts, and other documents, including but not limited to: service agreements, insurance agreements, fiscal, budgetary, and personnel documents, travel requests, contracts for the purchase of apparatus, furniture, equipment, supplies and books, as well as contracts entered into as necessary to receive federal funds allocated to the California Community Colleges, all within the limits of fiscal ability and sound budgetary controls and subject to such policies as may be established by the Board. (EC § 70901(b)(5).)

319. Grants.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), whenever the power to enter into a grant is invested in the Board, or when, in the judgment of the Chancellor, a grant is expressly or impliedly authorized to fulfill responsibilities or authorities vested in the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor shall have the authority to enter into such grants.

(b) The Chancellor shall secure Board approval before entering into any grant:

(1) In excess of $100,000; or
(2) Over three years in duration; or

The requirement for Board approval shall apply to any amendment of a grant which results in the original grant exceeding the specified limits, as well as the amendment of a grant where the amendment itself exceeds the specified limits. Under circumstances when the need to enter into a grant was not foreseeable, and when delaying approval of the grant until the next Board meeting would jeopardize the grant or frustrate its purpose, the Chancellor shall have the authority to enter into grants in excess of the limits specified in this subsection. Before entering into such grants, however, the Chancellor shall consult with the President of the Board.

(c) Prior to submitting grants to the Board for approval pursuant to subsection (b), the Chancellor shall either:

(1) present to the Board for its review and approval an expenditure plan outlining the nature, extent and need for any such grants; or
(2) provide a summary of the Request for Application (RFA) or other summary of the purpose and need for a grant to the Board of Governors prior to publicly releasing any such RFA or prior to making any informal commitment to award a grant. The Chancellor may proceed with the release of the RFA unless the Board President, with or without the advice of any appropriate Board Committee designated by the President, directs the Chancellor to withhold action within a 10 day period from the date the summary is provided.

(d) All grants awarded by the Board of Governors or the Chancellor on or after January 1, 1996, shall be awarded through competitive processes or through allocation formulas reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors, except that:

(1) Grants may be awarded competitively within regions.
(2) Grants for regional or statewide coordination activities for the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Matriculation, and Economic Development programs need not be competitively bid.

(3) Where there are conditions beyond the control of the Chancellor which limit competition, such as matching fund requirements or other agencies being required to select grantees, the Chancellor, in consultation with the President of the Board and the Chairperson of the appropriate committee, shall have authority to award grants without competition.

(e) Panels evaluating or scoring grant proposals will include or be comprised of outside readers as appropriate and will be comprised so as to assure objectivity and prevent conflicts of interest. In the event that outside readers are not used, the evaluation panel shall be comprised of staff from more than one division in the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor shall ensure that readers are appropriately trained with respect to the process for review of grant applications.

(f) Grants for the performance of functions which are ongoing in nature will be awarded in cycles of between one and five years in length. In advertising a grant for an ongoing function, district personnel will be apprised of the length of the cycle and the funding anticipated to be available for the duration of the project; provided however, that nothing in this Section shall be construed to preclude subsequent adjustment of actual funding levels to reflect unforeseen circumstances. Districts shall be further informed that continuance of the grant will depend on year-to-year funding, and continued satisfactory performance. The Chancellor shall have the authority to exempt grants described in Subsection (d)(2) or those awarded under the Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement (MESA) program, the Middle College High School program, or the Puente project from the duration limitations imposed by this paragraph.

(g) A district which, prior to January 1, 1996, has been awarded a grant on a non-competitive basis for the performance of an ongoing function may continue to be awarded that grant, at the discretion of the Chancellor, for a period of up to three additional fiscal years. Retention of the grant shall depend on continued availability of funds and satisfactory performance. At the conclusion of the term, the grant for the ongoing function shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

(h) To the extent that a grantee contracts with a private or public entity to perform certain parts of the grant, the grantee shall be required to disclose the intended purpose and amount of such subcontracting, shall agree to follow locally applicable competitive bidding processes in doing such subcontracting, and shall agree to name the subcontractors chosen.

(i) The procedures specified above shall not apply to grants which are distributed on an allocation formula basis which has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors.
Item 2.3

Issue

This item requests approval of the California Community Colleges 2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan prepared pursuant to the requirements of Government Code sections 13100-02 and Education Code sections 67501 and 67503.

Background

The California Community Colleges (CCC) comprise the largest postsecondary system of education in the world. Approximately 2.7 million students are enrolled each year at 72 districts encompassing 112 campuses, 70 approved off-campus centers and 23 separately reported district offices. These assets include 23,879 acres of land, 5,052 buildings, and 71 million gross square feet of space that includes 46 million assignable square feet of space. The system also has numerous off-campus outreach centers at various facilities.

STATE FUNDING AVAILABILITY

All of the existing state bond funds for CCC—a total of $1.67 billion from Proposition 47 (2002) and Proposition 55 (2004), and $1.48 billion from Proposition 1D (2006)—have either been spent or are committed to projects. Since the passage of Proposition 39 in November 2000, which lowered the threshold for voter approval of local bonds to 55 percent, 65 districts have passed $23.5 billion in local bonds.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

District Master Plans

The districts’ Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans are based on the local Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan for each campus. The California Code of Regulations, title 5 section 51008 requires districts to establish policies for, and approve, comprehensive or master plans which include academic master plans and long range master plans for facilities.

Master plans define how a district will meet the needs of its students and the community. They outline the short and long-range goals for a community college district and for each of its major campuses. Districts use master plans as a tool to periodically reevaluate educational programs and facilities needs in terms of past experience, current community requirements, and future goals.
An Educational Master Plan is therefore a prerequisite to the preparation of a Facilities Master Plan. The preparation of a Facilities Master Plan is in turn a prerequisite to the preparation of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans districts submit annually to the Facilities Planning Unit (FPU) of the Chancellor’s Office.

**Educational Master Plans**
An Educational Master Plan defines a district's goals for the future of the educational program. An educational plan describes current programs and details how those programs should develop in the future. The plan may introduce new programs and describe how those programs will be integrated into the curriculum and the direction in which they will grow in the future. Districts must consider state codes and regulations, long-term budget considerations, staffing requirements, and new educational delivery methods and technology when developing their educational master plans.

**Facilities Master Plans**
A Facilities Master Plan is derived from the education master plan and provides a blueprint for the facilities and technology that will be required to fully implement the Educational Master Plan of a district for each campus. The decisions a district makes in developing a Facilities Master Plan are very important due to the permanent nature of any decisions made. The construction process for buildings is lengthy and once buildings are constructed, change is very difficult. This is evidenced by the fact that 69 percent of buildings in the community college system are over 25-years old and 47 percent are over 40-years old.

**District and Systemwide 5-Year Capital Outlay Plans:**
Education Code sections 81820-23 require the governing board of each community college district to annually prepare and submit to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Board) a five-year plan for capital construction. These District Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans come to the FPU by July 1 of each year, although the submittal date for the 2012-13 district plans was deferred until September 1, 2010.

The FPU reviews and approves the districts’ Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans as part of the annual Capital Outlay Grant Application Process (please refer to Attachment A for further explanation of this process). California Code of Regulations title 5 section 57014 requires that, prior to receiving state funding, capital construction projects must be included in a district’s approved Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan.

Once the local Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans are approved by the FPU, the Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (5YCP) is compiled using the information included in each district’s approved plan. Government Code sections 13100-02 require each entity of state government to provide annually to the Department of Finance (DOF) information related to capital infrastructure needs and costs for a five-year period. Additionally, Education Code sections 67501 and 67503 require the FPU to prepare a 5YCP that identifies the needs and priorities of the entire CCC system. The 5YCP presented to the Board for approval in this item is intended to satisfy all of these statutory and regulatory requirements and define the facilities needs of the system irrespective of whether
there are sufficient funds available. The 5YCOP is submitted to the DOF after approval by the Board, and is then submitted to the Legislature in November 2011.

The system’s annual Capital Outlay Plan (as distinguished from the annual 5YCOP) is the culmination of the annual State Capital Outlay Grant Application Process, and is that list of projects for a particular fiscal year that is approved by the Board and submitted to the DOF for consideration of funding in the following January 10 Governor’s Budget. The annual Capital Outlay Plan—the basis for the first year of the 5YCOP—is prepared and approved by the Board before approval of the 5YCOP. The 2012-13 (annual) Capital Outlay Plan was approved by the Board in March 2011.

Analysis

2012-13 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan Summary

The FPU has evaluated and approved each district’s 2012-13 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan with respect to:

- Funding priorities for the system per the Board’s priority criteria,
- Capacity load ratios (i.e., existing facility capacity to enrollment load) for the various space types at each campus, and
- District’s ability to successfully complete projects within the plan’s timeframe.

For the period from 2012-13 through 2016-17, the CCC system has a projected need of $21.5 billion in capital facilities needs, of which $12.7 billion is for construction of new facilities and $8.8 billion is for modernization of existing facilities. An additional $9.4 billion of currently identified facilities needs are deferred to future years with $4.8 billion in out-year costs for continuing phases of projects started within the five-year plan time frame and $4.6 billion of need carryover into subsequent plan years, primarily for modernization projects. At this time, the total unmet facilities needs for the community college system for the five-year period of the plan are estimated to be approximately $30.9 billion. This unmet need includes estimated costs for the construction of an additional 15.4 million assignable square feet (asf) for new facilities to meet enrollment growth and 27.6 million asf for the modernization of existing facilities.

First Year of the 5YCOP

The first year of the 5YCOP, 2012-13, includes 260 projects totaling $1.9 billion. This includes 86 state-funded projects at $785 million—consisting of $460 million of state funding and $325 million of local funding—which was approved by the Board in March 2011 as the system’s annual Capital Outlay Plan. The remaining 174 projects in the first year of the plan are funded solely by the districts at a cost of $1.09 billion. The projects in the last four years of the plan have been scheduled based on facility needs and logistics, irrespective of funding availability. This scheduling
is a crucial step in moving toward a SYCOP that truly demonstrates the unmet facility needs of the entire CCC system rather than one that simply reflects available funding.

**Ten-Year Systemwide Capital Outlay Needs**

The plan also contains an analysis of the ten-year (2012-13 to 2021-22) facilities needs for the community college system. This ten-year need is estimated to be approximately **$37.2 billion** (which includes the $30.9 billion identified in the 2012-13 SYCOP).

**Student Enrollment**

The current economic and political environment has certainly had a negative impact on community college enrollments. District operating budgets have been cut, necessitating cutbacks in course offerings and the number of sessions districts offer. A net decrease of $290 million was approved by the Legislature in its budget plan that was vetoed by the Governor. Additionally, fees were increased from $20 to $26 per unit in fall 2009 and fees will increase to $36 per unit in 2011-12.

Enrollment at the CCC has grown 44 percent in the last 15 years. In a normal economic environment, CCC enrollment would have grown by at least 5.5 percent in 2009-10. Instead, decreased state operational funding caused the system to shrink by 4.8 percent in the 2009-10 academic year, beginning with a slight decline in fall 2009 enrollment (-0.2%) and further declines in enrollment as 2009-10 progressed. Approximately 140,000 students were turned away from community college campuses in 2009-10 due to course reductions indicating this dip in enrollment is entirely a budgetary rather than a demand response.

Historical data indicates that the decline in 2008-09 and 2009-10 student (headcount) enrollment is a short-term response to deep budget cuts. The community college system last experienced a decline in enrollment in academic years 2002-03 through 2004-05 due to a similarly difficult budget environment. Annual student enrollment dropped by approximately 10 percent. Fall 2004 saw a much smaller decrease in student enrollment (-1.2 percent) and student enrollment increased over the next four years until 2009-10.

There are other factors that indicate that the slight drop in enrollment will be short term. California Postsecondary Education Commission projects that approximately 81 percent of the enrollment growth in higher education over the next decade will occur in the community college system. Additionally, to the extent that further enrollment restrictions and higher fees at CSU and UC cause students to re-evaluate college plans, the transfer function may become more attractive to students that might otherwise have spent four years at CSU or UC.

Even with reductions to the system, this CCC 2012-13 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan still identifies a need for approximately 10.6 million additional assignable square feet. This translates to new classrooms and laboratories that are not available to offer course sections in green technology,
nursing, and other vital educational programs. Nor are these spaces available to provide necessary transfer courses students need to continue their education at public universities.

The capital outlay needs of the community college system are so great that this temporary downturn in enrollment will only delay, rather than decrease, the system’s need for capital facilities. Historical trends indicate that CCC enrollment will continue to increase, and this current decrease in enrollment does not reduce the longer term need for new and modernized facilities.

How are we doing?

The 2012-13 5YCOP identifies the need to construct a total of 43 million asf at a cost of $30.9 billion. This includes cost for the construction of an additional 15.4 million asf for new facilities to meet enrollment growth and 27.6 million asf of modernization needs.

The first systemwide 5YCOP was completed for the 2002-03 fiscal year. That plan identified the need for 36.4 million asf of facilities in the community college system at a cost of $12.1 billion. This includes $4.5 billion for new facilities (10.2 million asf) and $7.6 billion of modernization needs (26.2 million asf).

Since that first plan, the total systemwide needs have increased by 6.6 million asf (an 18 percent increase) and $18.8 billion in costs (155 percent increase). The reasons for the increase in space needed and costs are varied and include:

- The systemwide 5YCOP is prepared a year in advance utilizing the available data from the previous fiscal year. Therefore, the 2012-13 5YCOP, due to the DOF on July 1, 2011, uses data from the districts’ 2012-13 Five-Year Construction Plans submitted on September 1, 2010, which contain data from the previous fiscal year (2009-10).

- The 2002-03 5YCOP was based on the number of FTES in 2000-01 of 1,052,963 FTES. The 2012-13 plan is based on 1,347,211 FTES for 2009-10. This represents an average 28 percent increase in FTES throughout the system.

- The need for new space to accommodate enrollment growth has increased by 51 percent. Construction of new space is more expensive than modernization of existing space and the type of space currently being constructed is the more expensive space such as laboratory, learning resource centers, and career technical spaces. Further, the need for new space at high growth campuses will be much higher than the average.

In recognition that projects throughout the state were bidding at substantially over authorized amounts, the Chancellor’s Office cost guidelines were increased by 30 percent in 2007. This was followed by a change in the way inflation is calculated for state funded projects per DOF that accounted for an additional 25-30 percent increase in construction costs. These two changes resulted in substantial increases to project costs to meet the realities of the market.
The Legislature did not approve an education bond in 2008 and in 2010, creating a backlog of community college projects. The proposed 2012-13 Capital Outlay Plan is dependent upon a new bond in 2012. Without state bond funds, the backlog of community college projects will continue to grow. The FPU currently has received proposals for projects totaling approximately $2.8 billion. The new Final Project Proposals for 2013-14 due on August 1, 2011, will add to this backlog.

**Recommended Action**

The recommendation is for the Board of Governors to approve the systemwide 2012-13 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan as presented.

**Staff:** Lan Yuan, Specialist  
*College Finance and Facilities Planning*
Community College Districts have the responsibility to maintain, renew, and enlarge the facilities at their institutions on behalf of the students they serve. In order to accomplish these objectives, the districts are authorized to issue commercial paper and to seek local and state financing for their facilities.

In addition to these local efforts, the state’s capital outlay program provides voter-approved statewide general obligation bonds through grants to fund capital outlay projects on community college campuses. These grants developed pursuant to the annual State Capital Outlay Grant Application Process and approved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges comprise approximately only 5 to 10 percent of the total capital outlay funding used by community college districts. However, for some districts with minimal local resources for facilities, funds provided from the State Capital Outlay Grant Application Process are the only source of funds available to modernize facilities and/or construct new buildings.

The Board has adopted Priority Funding Categories to assist districts in their capital planning efforts so that the capital outlay proposals submitted for consideration of state funding reflect the state’s priorities. The Board Priority Funding Categories give preference to projects that best meet the following priorities:

- Expand campuses appropriately to meet enrollment demands,
- Modernize aging facilities,
- Meet the space utilization standards found in the California Code of Regulations, title 5, and,
- Leverage state funds with local funds to provide facilities at the least cost to the state.

The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit (FPU) of the Chancellor’s Office administers the Capital Outlay Grant Application Process for the community college system on behalf of the Board. Under the policy guidance and direction of the Board, the FPU assists districts in meeting guidelines, regulations, and other requirements to receive state funding for capital construction projects.

The Capital Outlay Grant Application Process is based on the Board Priority Funding Categories and has three district inputs which culminate in the annual Capital Outlay Plan:

1) District Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans,
2) Initial Project Proposals, and
3) Final Project Proposals.
BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRIORITY FUNDING CATEGORIES

There are six Priority Funding Categories for which projects are classified (Categories A through F). Table 1 below illustrates the maximum share of state funding allocated to each category in a specific plan year as follows:

Table 1
Board Priority Funding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Funding Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>No more than 50% of total available funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Growth – Instructional Space</td>
<td>50 percent of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Modernize – Instructional Space</td>
<td>25 percent of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Complete Campus</td>
<td>15 percent of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Growth – Instructional Support</td>
<td>5 percent of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Modernize – Instructional Support</td>
<td>5 percent of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category A – Health & Safety Projects: The most critical projects, life-safety projects, are assigned to Category A. Projects in Category A involve life and safety issues and are ranked according to the number of people threatened or affected by the condition of a facility or site.

Categories B & E – Growth Projects: Projects that expand space on sites (Categories B and E) earn eligibility scores based upon a site’s need for space, projected enrollment growth over the next five years, the extent to which the proposed solution provides the needed space, and the extent to which local funds directly mitigate state costs of the project.

Categories C & F – Modernization Projects: Projects that modernize existing space (Categories C and F) earn eligibility points based upon the age and condition of the existing facility or its infrastructure and the extent to which local funds directly mitigate state costs of the project.

Category D – Complete Campus Projects: Projects in Category D provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to promote a complete campus concept. Projects in Category D do not fit the criteria for the other Board categories but are an integral part of a campus and essential to fulfilling the educational mission at each campus. Examples include physical education facilities, performing arts centers, and child development centers. Category D projects earn eligibility points based upon the age of the campus, additional programs/services that can be offered because of the project, the project design solution, and the extent to which local funds directly mitigate state costs of the project.

Funding Allocation Among Categories
Category A projects involve health and safety issues and are the highest priority in the Capital Outlay Plan. Category A projects are ranked according to the number of people threatened or effected by the condition of a facility or site, and no more than 50 percent of the annual allocation of state funds are made available for projects in this Category.

Once the continuing phases of previously funded projects and new Category A projects are prioritized, projects in the remaining categories are prioritized based on various factors using the Priority Funding Category. The proposals compete for the highest ranking within each Category based on points calculated using the age of facility, enrollment capacity load ratios, cost, project scope, and local contribution.

Projects in Categories B through F are ranked by eligibility points (highest to lowest). The annual Capital Outlay Plan includes a maximum of one project from any Category B through F per authorized site. With the exception of projects that address health and safety, seismic or infrastructure failure problems, only one “new start” project per year is funded per authorized site. This ensures that more campuses will likely have new proposals included in the annual Capital Outlay Plan.

If more than one project is eligible for potential funding from Categories B through F per authorized site, the project with the highest local ranking from the district’s Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan is proposed for funding. In recent years, the number of proposals seeking state funds and obtaining Board approval has greatly exceeded the amount of state funds available. Every year valid, meritorious proposals are excluded from the statewide spending plan. To mitigate such exclusions, the development of the proposed annual Capital Outlay Plan may include a realignment of funds between categories.

**DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLANS**

Education Code sections 81820-23 require the governing board of each community college district to annually prepare and submit to the FPU a five-year plan for capital construction. California Code of Regulations, title 5 section 57014 requires districts to receive approval of their Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans from the FPU prior to receiving state funding for projects. Districts are also required to complete district and campus master plans before preparing their Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans. The districts’ Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans are submitted to the FPU on July 1 of each year.

**District Master Plans**

The districts’ Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans are based on the local Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan for each campus. The California Code of Regulations, title 5 section 51008 requires districts to establish policies for, and approve, comprehensive or master plans which include academic master plans and long range master plans for facilities.

Master plans define how a district will meet the needs of its students and the community. They outline the short and long-range goals for a community college district and for each of its major
campuses. Districts use master plans as a tool to periodically reevaluate educational programs and facilities needs in terms of past experience, current community requirements, and future goals.

An Educational Master Plan is therefore a prerequisite to the preparation of a Facilities Master Plan. The preparation of a Facilities Master Plan is in turn a prerequisite to the preparation of the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans districts submit annually to the FPU.

Educational Master Plans:

An Educational Master Plan defines a district’s goals for the future of the educational program. An educational plan describes current programs and details how those programs should develop in the future. The plan may introduce new programs and describe how those programs will be integrated into the curriculum and the direction in which they will grow in the future. Districts must consider state codes and regulations, long-term budget considerations, staffing requirements, and new educational delivery methods and technology when developing their educational master plans.

Facilities Master Plans:

A Facilities Master Plan is derived from the education master plan and provides a blueprint for the facilities and technology that will be required to fully implement the Educational Master Plan of a district for each campus. The decisions a district makes in developing a Facilities Master Plan are very important due to the permanent nature of any decisions made. The construction process for buildings is lengthy and once buildings are constructed, change is very difficult. This is evidenced by the fact that 69 percent of buildings in the community college system are over 25-years old and 47 percent are over 40-years old.

Although educational programming is always supposed to drive facilities planning, the permanent nature of facilities will limit or dampen the ability of the Educational Master Plan to respond to rapid changes in educational program, delivery systems and technology. Given this permanence, there are many factors districts must take into consideration as they develop Facilities Master Plans:

1. Community College Change and Growth: Community colleges are inherently difficult to plan because the only constant is change – change in the size of the campus, rules and regulations, educational programs, administration, staff and faculty, and a myriad of other factors. Community college campuses often grow to many times their original size over a long period of time so the need to plan for and respond to change must be integral to a facilities plan.

2. Campus Design Guidelines – The Facilities Master Plan must define campus design guidelines, not only to provide a cohesive look for the entire campus but to ensure access and functionality. The campus needs to be designed for flexibility so that facilities can change to the extent possible to support changes in the educational program.

3. State Rules & Guidelines – California’s community colleges are governed by laws, regulations and guidelines that are utilized by various governmental entities (i.e., Board of Governors, Department of Finance, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Division of the State
Architect) in the review of new campuses and building projects. The Facilities Master Plan for any campus must be consistent with state rules and guidelines.

4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – CEQA requires districts to define and possibly mitigate the impact of construction or new development on neighboring properties. Districts must evaluate the impact of traffic, pedestrian traffic, storm water run-off, historic structures and features, and a variety of other potential impacts on neighboring properties when developing a new site or starting a new project on an existing site.

5. Operational Considerations – The facilities planning process must take into account various operational issues, including those that influence staffing requirements and energy usage for new and/or modernized facilities. Incentives are provided by the Board and the various Utility Companies that encourage energy efficient design and construction. Laws and regulations impact staffing levels such as: the 75/25 percent full-time/part-time ratio of faculty; the 50 Percent Law which requires 50 percent of the operating costs to be spent on instruction; funding caps which limit the growth of a district, and collective bargaining which determines class size limitations and other working condition issues. Classroom scheduling issues must also be taken into account when determining the number and size of classrooms: faculty preference of rooms, availability of rooms, size of rooms, physical adequacy of rooms to teach specific types of courses, and the preference of students and faculty to take morning classes.

6. Funding Availability – Funding for community college facilities is always less than what is required to support the facility needs of the community college system. State funding is dependent upon the passage of statewide general obligation bonds, and local funding is dependent upon the passage of local general obligation bonds. In recent years, the availability of state funds to finance new community college projects has been constrained due to the lack of an education bond in 2008 and 2010. Local bond funds are constrained due to voter reluctance to approve bonds due to the current negative economic environment as well as decreases in assessed property values which prevent the issuance of approved local bonds. Facilities Master Plans must plan to the extent possible for buildings that are efficient, flexible (can be used for more than one purpose and adaptable to change over time), and cost effective. Careful planning of classroom scheduling within existing facilities can increase facility utilization without the need for new buildings. Districts must explore alternative instructional delivery options such as distance education which can also mitigate the need for new facilities.

Districts submit their Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans using the Facility Utilization Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) online database. FUSION is a web-based project planning and management tool activated in May 2003. A consortium of community college districts provided the initial funds to develop FUSION, and all districts annually fund the operation and maintenance of FUSION. The Foundation for California Community Colleges and the FPU provide support for FUSION. FUSION provides FPU staff, district staff and consultants access to data and applications useful in assisting with the administration of district capital outlay programs. Districts use FUSION to better assess the various components of their current buildings, update their annual space inventory reports, and update their annual district Five-Year Capital Outlay Plans. FUSION is also used to prepare Initial Project Proposals and selected components of Final Project Proposals as part of the application process for state capital outlay funds.
INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

An Initial Project Proposal (IPP) is submitted by districts requesting state funding for projects included in the district Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. The IPP provides a general project description including space, cost and funding schedule. Projects are to be submitted to the FPU by July 1 using the three-page IPP form.

The description of the intent and purpose of each project enables FPU staff to determine the appropriate Board Priority Funding Category to assign for the project. The IPP step in the screening process also allows the FPU to more accurately assess a district’s capital outlay needs before there is a significant investment of time and money in projects by the district. After evaluating the IPPs, the FPU notifies the districts of those IPPs to be developed into Final Project Proposals which are due the following year for possible submission to the Board for project scope approval.

FINAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

A Final Project Proposal (FPP) describes the scope, cost, schedule, and financing array of a project and includes conceptual drawings of the project. The description of the project in the FPP includes an assessment of the problems of the existing facilities, as well as an analysis of alternatives considered prior to proposing the recommended solution. The proposal includes a detailed space array, detailed cost estimate and summary calculation of the state fundable equipment allowance.

The FPU staff performs an in-depth analysis of each FFP. This analysis determines the following for each project:

- Accurate cost and scope
- Board Priority Funding Category for each project
- Feasible calendar and timing of state funds, and
- Comparison of a project’s merits with other projects in the same category.

Scope Approval

The scope of work in an FPP is eligible for Board approval if it is consistent with the requirements, standards, and guidelines outlined in the Education Code, California Code of Regulations, title 5, and the State Administrative Manual/Capitalized Assets section 6800. The FPU staff determine whether or not a proposal satisfies the required governmental rules and regulations and works with districts to refine project proposals.

Collectively, the FPU staff determine which projects will be proposed to the Board for scope approval for a specific fiscal year. The development of a scope approval list draws upon a project’s Board Priority Funding Category, ranking among other projects also within the same category, and total need for state funds versus the availability of state funds to determine which projects may be included on the list. The scope approval list is then submitted to the Board for approval before the annual Capital Outlay Plan is created.
ANNUAL CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN

The FPU develops an annual Capital Outlay Plan derived from the scope approval list for approval by the Board. The scope approval list may be refined based on project changes, funding availability, and other factors as the annual Capital Outlay Plan is developed. Following Board approval, the annual Capital Outlay Plan is submitted to the Department of Finance for consideration of funding in the next budget cycle.

Project Phasing. The annual Capital Outlay Plan includes projects seeking state financing to complete preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment phases. Brand new projects are known as “new start projects,” and projects seeking to obtain state funding for their remaining project phases are known as “continuing projects.”

Ready Access Projects. A “Ready Access” project is a special type of new start project that is seeking a state appropriation for all phases in a single budget cycle. A district is required to finance at least ten percent of the state supportable cost for a Ready Access project and must commit to completing the project with no changes in scope or state financing.

Design-Build Projects. “Design-Build” is a project delivery method that community college districts can use instead of the traditional Design-Bid-Build delivery method. A Design-Build project will be funded in two phases: 1) Design and 2) Construction. The Design-Build delivery method involves a process whereby district staff work with an architect to develop minimum design standards, room capabilities, and functional adjacencies for new or redesigned space without first establishing floor plans. These design standards are assembled into bid documents accompanied by the anticipated project budget and distributed to multiple Design-Builders so that they can develop proposed solutions with various floor plans and elevations. District staff review the various proposals and select a winning Design-Builder who in turn completes the development of construction documents and builds the project.

Following a successful pilot test involving more than ten projects at eight districts, SB 614 (chapter 471/statutes 2007) authorized community colleges to use the Design-Build delivery method for both locally-funded and state-funded community college projects costing more than $2.5 million. The proposed spending plan for 2012-13 contains one Design-Build project seeking state funds for the Design (D) phase.

Annual funding of the proposed projects is contingent on meeting the Governor’s priorities and the availability of funds to meet continuing needs. The development of the annual Capital Outlay Plan also considers the state funds needed by projects in future budget years so that a project included in the annual Capital Outlay Plan can have a reasonable expectation to receive the state funds necessary in future years to allow completion of the project.

Annual “Zero-Based” Budgeting Method. The annual Capital Outlay Plan is developed using a “zero-based” budgeting method in which all proposals eligible to compete in a specific fiscal year are evaluated to determine that the highest priority projects are included in the annual Capital Outlay Plan based on the funds available. FPPs not included in a specific year’s spending plan must compete in a subsequent budget cycle. Between budget cycles, districts may update or modify the
proposals as needed to reflect changing local needs or priorities and resubmit in the next budget cycle. Otherwise FPPs that are submitted for state funding but do not receive appropriations in the annual state budget act have no automatic special standing in subsequent budget cycles.

**Appeals Process.** An appeal process is available when a district believes that its project was omitted in error from either the state scope approval list or proposed annual Capital Outlay Plan. Districts are urged to contact their facilities planner in the FPU for an explanation of the project’s priority status. After discussions with the facilities planner, if need be districts may appeal in writing to the Chancellor.

**DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE/LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

Once the annual Capital Outlay Plan is approved by the Board, FPU staff advocate for state funding with the Department of Finance and the Legislature for inclusion in the Governor’s Budget and the state Budget Act, respectively. The FPPs included in the Capital Outlay Plan are transitioned into Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals (COBCPs) and submitted to the Department of Finance on July 1 of each year (usually a year after the FPPs are submitted to the FPU).

The Department of Finance evaluates each COBCP for potential inclusion in the next Governor’s Budget. Once the project is included in the Governor’s Budget, it is then evaluated by Legislative staff for potential inclusion in the final state Budget Act. The Administration and Legislative Budget Committees scrutinize all capital construction projects to determine if projects meet current state priorities, i.e., seismic, life-safety, vital infrastructure, major code deficiencies, and increased instructional access.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS STANDING ORDERS, CHAPTER 3, ARTICLE 333 – STUDENT SENATE

ACTION
Presentation: Linda Michalowski, Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs

Item 3.1

Issue

This item is the second reading of the proposed amendments to the Board of Governors Procedures and Standing Orders related to the Student Senate for Board of Governors consideration.

Background

The first reading of the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders on the Student Senate for California Community Colleges (SSCCC) was presented in May 2011. The amended Standing Orders are intended to clarify the role of the Chancellor’s Office as the administrative arm of the Board in providing support to the SSCCC and ensuring its organizational integrity as the representative of community college students in conjunction with their associated student organizations in state-level shared governance. The amendments specifically address the verification of student eligibility to serve on the SSCCC and minimum standards of conduct at state-sponsored events. In addition, a change is proposed to conform the language in the Standing Orders with language in existing title 5 regulations.

Since the May 2011 first reading, the Chancellor’s Office has not received any formal comments on the proposed Standing Orders changes. However, there has been extensive discussion by the Student Senate Council and among student leaders about the implications of the proposed changes. Assurance has been provided that the Standing Orders amendments would not affect the ability of the Student Senate to continue to have an independent voice in the consultation process.

Analysis

The proposed amendments to the Standing Orders are in response to issues that confronted the Student Senate Council and the Chancellor’s Office during the last year:

Verification of eligibility—A few members of the Student Senate sought to keep their seats on the Council despite their failure to verify continued academic eligibility. In the course of working with the Council majority to resolve this situation, the authority of the Chancellor’s
Office to conduct the eligibility verifications of the Council members was challenged. The proposed *Standing Orders* amendments would clarify that authority.

**Minimum standards of conduct**—Beginning with the Spring 2011 General Assembly, the Chancellor’s Office has assumed direct responsibility for hosting all SSCCC events, including contracting with hotel vendors. As a result, the Board and Chancellor’s Office face direct legal and financial liability in addition to public scrutiny in the event consequences result from improper conduct. Currently, there is no explicit authority for the Chancellor’s Office to intervene on the Board’s behalf if the Student Senate Council does not take prompt action to address problems. The proposed amendments would clarify the Chancellor’s Office responsibility and role in such situations.

The Student Senate was created by community college students who came together in a Presidential Summit in May 2005 that was called and funded by the Chancellor’s Office, the Academic Senate, the California Community Colleges (CCC) Student Affairs Association and the CCC Chief Student Services Administrators Association. Although it is Board-sponsored and not independent, the Student Senate has always had independence of thought and action to represent the interests of community college students. The proposed *Standing Orders* amendments would not change the Student Senate’s ability to represent an independent student voice.

The Chancellor’s Office developed the eligibility verification procedures now in place in consultation with the Student Senate Council and has given the Council the opportunity to review and provide input for the new minimum standards of conduct policy as well. That policy includes assurances that the Chancellor’s Office will limit its involvement to the minimum necessary to protect health and safety and the interests of the Board of Governors.

The Chancellor’s Office presented the proposed *Standing Orders* changes to the Student Senate Council on May 1 and the Council voted to support the changes. A few Council members, who were in the minority at that meeting, requested reconsideration of that position at the June 4-5 Council meeting. After extensive discussion, the Council maintained its support position.

**Recommended Action**

That the Board approve the proposed *Board of Governors Standing Orders* amendments to Chapter 3, Article 333, on the Student Senate.

**Staff:** Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, Dean of Student Services
Proposed Amendment to
Board of Governors Standing Orders, Chapter 3, Article 333 - Student Senate

(a) Pursuant to established Board policy on the participation of students in governance, and in order that the students of the California Community Colleges may have a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of systemwide policy adopted by the Board of Governors, a Student Senate has been established through ratification by local student body governments.

(b) The Board of Governors recognizes the Student Senate as the representative of community college students in conjunction with associated student organizations in the Consultation Process and before the Board of Governors and Chancellor’s Office.

(c) The Chancellor and designated staff are authorized to take those actions needed to ensure the integrity of the Student Senate, including but not limited to, ensuring all eligibility requirements are met and establishing and enforcing minimum standards of student conduct.
NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

AMENDMENT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 5 REGARDING Noncredit Course and Program Approval

Notice published June 30, 2011

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to Standing Order 200, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges proposes to adopt the regulations described below after considering all comments, objections, or recommendations regarding the proposed action.

PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing will be held during the next regularly scheduled Board of Governors meeting on July 11-12, 2011, at 1102 Q Street, Sacramento, California. The Board meeting will commence at the hour of 9:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the business of the Agency will permit. The room is wheelchair accessible. Other disability-related accommodations such as materials in alternate media, sign language interpreters, or real time transcription will be provided to persons with disabilities upon request. Parking accessible for persons with disabilities is available near the facility. Persons requesting such accommodations should notify Njeri Griffin, 1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811-6549, ngriffin@cccco.edu, 916-445-8508, no less than five working days prior to the meeting. The Chancellor’s Office will make efforts to meet requests made after such date, if possible.

At the hearing, any person may present statements or arguments, orally or in writing, relevant to the proposed regulatory action described in the Informative Digest. The Board of Governors requests, but does not require, that persons who make oral comments at the hearing also submit a written summary of their comments. No oral comments will be accepted subsequent to this public hearing.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action. To ensure that your comments have the maximum effect in developing the final regulations, we urge you to identify clearly the specific section or sections of the proposed regulations that each of your comments addresses and to arrange your comments in the same order as the proposed regulations. Please send your comments to:
MODIFICATIONS TO PROPOSED TITLE 5 AMENDMENTS

Following the public hearing and considering all timely and relevant comments received, the Board of Governors may adopt the proposed regulations substantially as described in this Notice or may modify the proposed regulations if the modifications are sufficiently related to the original text. With the exception of technical or grammatical changes, the full text of any modified regulation will be available for 15 days prior to its adoption from Michelle Goldberg and will be mailed to those persons who submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action, or who provide oral comments at the public hearing, or who have requested notification of any changes to the proposal.

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Authority: Education Code sections 66700, 70901, 70901.5, 78401 and 84760.5
Reference: Education Code sections 70901, 70901.5, 70902, 78401, 84750.5, 84760.5

INFORMATIVE DIGEST

Current title 5 regulations need consistency and clarity to align with the Chancellor’s Office new curriculum database and electronic curriculum proposal submission criteria for noncredit course and noncredit programs.

The proposed revisions clarify certain sections and repeal others without changing the approval process. All noncredit courses, including High School noncredit courses, must still be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. Funding is not affected by these proposed changes, because it is still based on positive attendance in approved noncredit courses. The qualifying factors for approval of enhanced funding noncredit programs, those that result in a certificate of completion or certificate of competency, remain the same. Delegated authority for the approval of noncredit programs that are not eligible for enhanced funding is proposed to be given to the district governing board.
Sections 55152 and 55153 are proposed for repeal as the instructions have been condensed and put into a single revised section 55151. Proposed changes remove the threshold of 288 hours of instruction as this number has no relevant meaning to noncredit programs as they exist in the California community colleges. In addition, the definitions of certificate of completion and certificate of competency are modified to align with statutory language.

**ESTIMATED COST OR SAVINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

The estimated cost or savings of the proposed amendments are anticipated to be as follows:

- **Mandate on local agencies or community college districts:** None
- **Cost or savings to state agencies:** None
- **Costs to local agencies or community college districts for which reimbursement would be required pursuant to part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of division 4 title 2 of the Government Code:** None
- **Other non-discretionary cost or savings imposed on community college districts:** None
- **Cost or savings in federal funding to state agencies:** None

The effect of the adoption of the proposed regulations will not impose increased costs or new costs to community college districts that are required to be reimbursed under section 17561 of the Government Code. Such determination will be made a formal part of the public hearing at the time and place described above. Furthermore, there are no direct costs or indirect costs, or savings to any state agency, no costs or savings in federal funding to the state and no non-discretionary costs or savings to local agencies.

**CONTACT PERSON**

Inquiries concerning the content of these regulations may be directed to:

Stephanie Low, Dean  
Academic Affairs Division  
California Community Colleges  
Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811-6549  
Telephone: 916-322-6817  
E-mail: lows@cccco.edu

Inquiries concerning the regulatory process may be directed to Michelle Goldberg, Staff Counsel at 916-324-4711 or mgoldberg@cccco.edu.
TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS AND CORRESPONDING DOCUMENTS

Copies of the exact language of the proposed regulation, and all of the information upon which the proposal is based, may be obtained online at:

Those who receive the Board of Governors Agenda package for the July 11-12, 2011, meeting can find a further description of the proposal and the full text of the regulations in agenda item number 3.2.

You may also request a copy of the proposal from Michelle Goldberg, using the contact information provided above.

MG/ce
PROPOSED TITLE 5 CHANGE ON APPORTIONMENT LIMIT FOR ENROLLMENT IN CREDIT COURSES (SECTIONS 55024, 55040, 55042, 58161, AND 58161.5)

ACTION
Presentation: Linda Michalowski, Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs
Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Item 3.2

Issue

This item presents for a second reading and Board consideration the proposed title 5 changes to place a limit on apportionment funding for repeated enrollments in credit courses.

Background

Given reduced system capacity and increased enrollment demand faced by the California Community Colleges, a state-level policy that limits the number of times a student can retake the same class with the district claiming apportionment is needed to ensure that as many students as possible are provided the opportunity to access a postsecondary education. Current regulations limit the number of times a student can repeat a course to improve a substandard grade or after withdrawing from the same course. However, in combination those regulations allow students the opportunity to repeat courses multiple times at a significant cost to new students who cannot get into needed courses.

The proposed title 5 changes would limit apportionment for enrollment in a single course to three enrollments with specific exceptions. Districts would be allowed to permit one additional funded enrollment on an appeal basis if a student needs to repeat a course due to a significant lapse of time since it was last taken, or when there are specific extenuating circumstances such as flood, fire, or other extraordinary conditions beyond the student’s control. Districts could still allow a student to enroll in the same course beyond the “3+1” limit based on local petition or appeal policies but they would not be allowed to claim apportionment for these additional enrollments.

Official Notice of proposed changes to the California Code of Regulations, title 5, regarding apportionment limits for credit course enrollment, repetition and withdrawal was published on April 28, 2011. The original proposed text was made available for public comment for at least 45 days from April 28, 2011, through June 16, 2011. The Notice specified the process to comment on the proposed changes. One written comment was received during the comment period. The proposed title 5 change to limit apportionment for repeat credit course enrollment was first presented to the Board for first reading and public hearing on May 9, 2011. Comments from two people were heard at the public hearing. Only three comments were received during the public comment period. A summary of the public comments received is included in Attachment 3.
In addition, a new subdivision (d) is proposed to be added to section 58161 as a result of further
staff analysis that determined these regulations would inadvertently impact courses specifically
identified as repeatable, such as PE and fine and performing arts, in section 55041. As was reported
to the Board in May, the Chancellor’s Office is working with the System Advisory Committee on
Curriculum to review current policy on repeatable courses and intends to bring forward additional
regulatory proposals in the fall to establish appropriate enrollment limits for them. It was not the
intent of this set of amendments to prematurely enact policy changes in that area. The new
amendment would retain current regulatory language until the policy conversation can occur. The
proposed changes to the original proposal necessitates a renotice of the proposed regulatory action
and an opportunity for public comment on the proposed change outlined in the renotice. To
approve this amendment, the Board must adopt the resolution provided under “Recommended
Action.”

Analysis

California’s Master Plan for Higher Education requires the California Community Colleges to accept
all students 18 years and older who can benefit from a postsecondary education. As a result of the
state’s ongoing budget crisis and the significant budget cuts reducing capacity and the availability of
courses, this open access policy poses a challenge when managing enrollment demand. Current
title 5 regulations allow a student to retake the same course multiple times with colleges generating
state apportionment. Budget cuts to the California community colleges have significantly impacted
the system’s ability to meet enrollment demand. It’s anticipated that the additional cuts to
apportionment funding for 2011-12 will likely result in hundreds of thousands of students who will
not be able to enroll in a California community college.

As part of the implementation of the System Strategic Plan, the Chancellor’s Office undertook a
broad review and revision of chapter 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. As a result,
the Board of Governors adopted a series of regulatory changes in 2007, 2008, and 2009 including
changes to clarify and limit credit course repeats and withdrawals.

Current title 5 regulations on course withdrawal allow a student to withdraw from the same credit
course up to four times with the district claiming apportionment. In addition, title 5 regulations on
course repetition allow a student to repeat the same course up to two times to alleviate a
substandard grade. Through the interaction of these sections, a student can enroll in the same
course multiple times with the district generating apportionment for each enrollment. This is not an
efficient use of limited resources. In addition, this policy does not serve students well.

The proposed apportionment limit on credit course re-enrollment would allow three enrollments,
plus one exception for extenuating circumstances and/or an educational need to repeat a course
due to a significant lapse of time. Current regulations on both course withdrawal and course
repetition exempt certain re-enrollments from these limits, such as training that is legally mandated
for the student’s occupation, special courses for students with disabilities, cooperative work
experience courses, repetition of portions of open entry-open exit courses, or enrollments resulting
from military deployment or a natural disaster affecting the community college district. Current
regulations also allow districts to approve additional withdrawals or repetitions on a petition basis under specific circumstances; one is allowed when the college determines there has been an educationally significant lapse of time since the course was last taken and two are allowed for extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the student. The provisions regarding exemptions and appeals remain substantially unchanged in the proposed revisions, except that an appeal based on extenuating circumstances can only be granted once for apportionment funding.

Recommended Action

The Board of Governors is asked to adopt the following resolution:

Be it Resolved

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, acting pursuant to Education Code sections 66700, 70901(c) and 70901.5, hereby:

- accepts the comments and proposed responses to the proposed regulatory action published April 28, 2011;
- approves the proposed changes to the proposed amendments to the regulations;
- directs the Chancellor to circulate the proposed changes for a 15-day public comment period in accordance with the Standing Orders;
- authorizes the Chancellor to consider and respond to all written and oral comments received during the additional comment period on behalf of the Board;
- if no relevant comments to the proposed changes are received during the 15-day public comment period, the proposed amendments with changes are deemed adopted, and the Chancellor is directed to file the regulations with the Secretary of State and submit the regulations to the Office of Administrative Law for printing upon receipt of an approved Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement from the Department of Finance;
- authorizes the Chancellor to take any necessary ministerial action to process these regulations; and,
- adopts the regulations effective thirty days after filing with the Secretary of State and submission of the regulations to the Office of Administrative Law.

Staff: Sonia Ortiz-Mercedo, Dean, Student Services
Stephanie Low, Dean, Academic Affairs
ATTACHMENT 1

The text originally proposed to be added is underlined; text originally proposed to be deleted is displayed in strikeout. The 15-day text proposed to be added is in bold underline, text proposed to be deleted is displayed in bold strikeout.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TITLE 5 REGULATIONS:
APPORTIONMENT LIMITS FOR CREDIT COURSE ENROLLMENT
REPETITION AND WITHDRAWAL

1. Section 55024 of article 2 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55024. Withdrawal.
(a) The governing board of a district which decides to provide a withdrawal procedure shall adopt a policy which provides for withdrawal from credit courses consistent with the following:
(1) Withdrawal from a course or courses shall be authorized through the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75 percent of a term, whichever is less). The governing board, however, may establish a final withdrawal date which prohibits withdrawal after a designated point in time between the end of the fourth week of instruction (or 30 percent of a term, whichever is less) and the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75 percent of a term, whichever is less). The academic record of a student who remains in a course beyond the time allowed by district policy must reflect a symbol as authorized in section 55023 other than a “W.”
(2) The governing board may by regulation authorize withdrawal from a course or courses in extenuating circumstances after the last day of the fourteenth week (or 75 percent of a term, whichever is less) upon petition of the student or his or her representative and after consultation with the appropriate faculty. Extenuating circumstances are verified cases of accidents, illnesses or other circumstances beyond the control of the student.
(3) No notation (“W” or other) shall be made on the academic record of the student who withdraws during the first four weeks or 30 percent of a term, whichever is less. The governing board may establish a period of time shorter than the first four weeks or 30 percent of a term, during which no notation shall be made.
(4) Withdrawal between the end of the fourth week (or such time as established by the district) and the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75 percent of a term, whichever is less) shall be authorized, provided the appropriate faculty is informed.
(5) Withdrawal after the end of the fourteenth week (or 75 percent of a term, whichever is less) when the district has authorized such withdrawal in extenuating circumstances, after consultation with appropriate faculty, shall be recorded as a “W.”
(6) For purposes of withdrawal policies, the term “appropriate faculty” means the instructor of each course section in question or, in the event the instructor cannot be contacted, the department chair or appropriate administrator.

(7) The “W” shall not be used in calculating grade point averages, but shall be used in determining probation and dismissal pursuant to article 3 of this subchapter.

(8) A “W” shall not be assigned, or if assigned shall be removed, from a student's academic record, if a determination is made pursuant to sections 59300 et seq. that the student withdrew from the course due to discriminatory treatment or due to retaliation for alleging discriminatory treatment.

(9) Effective July 1, 2009, the district policy shall establish the number of times (not to exceed four times) that a student may withdraw and receive a “W” symbol on his or her record for enrollment in the same course. The district policy may permit a student to enroll again in a course after having previously received the authorized number of “W” symbols in the same course in colleges within the district pursuant to section 58161.5, if:

(A) apportionment is not claimed, and

(B) the chief instructional officer, chief student services officer or other district official designated in the district policy approves such enrollment after review of a petition filed by the student.

(10) The district policy may provide that a “W” symbol will not be assigned to any student who withdrew from one or more classes, where such withdrawal was necessary due to fire, flood or other extraordinary conditions and the withdrawal is authorized by the district pursuant to section 58509.

(11) The district policy shall include provisions for intervention in cases of multiple withdrawals.

(b) Within the parameters set forth in subdivision (a), criteria for withdrawal and the procedures to accomplish it shall be established by the district governing board and published in college catalogs.

(c) A district’s responsibilities with respect to enrollment or attendance accounting shall not be modified or superseded in any way by adoption of a withdrawal policy.

(d) The governing board of a district which decides to provide a withdrawal policy shall also adopt military withdrawal procedures consistent with the following:

(1) “Military Withdrawal” occurs when a student who is a member of an active or reserve United States military service receives orders compelling a withdrawal from courses. Upon verification of such orders, a withdrawal symbol may be assigned at any time after the period established by the governing board during which no notation is made for withdrawals. The withdrawal symbol so assigned shall be a “MW.”

(2) Military withdrawals shall not be counted in progress probation and dismissal calculations.

(3) “MW” shall not be counted for the permitted number of withdrawals.

(4) In no case may a military withdrawal result in a student being assigned an “FW” grade.

(e) Notwithstanding the limits set forth above, apportionment will be limited as set forth in section 58161.
2. Section 55040 of article 4 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55040. District Policy for Course Repetition.
  (a) The governing board of each community college district shall adopt and publish policies and procedures pertaining to the repetition of credit courses. Such policies and procedures shall not conflict with section 55025 or Education Code section 76224, pertaining to the finality of grades assigned by instructors, or with subchapter 2.5 (commencing with section 59020) of chapter 10 of this division, pertaining to the retention and destruction of student records.

(b) For purposes of course repetition, academic renewal, and all other related provisions in this division, the following terms shall have the meanings specified below:

  (1) “Course repetition” occurs when a student who has previously received an evaluative symbol as defined in section 55023, in a particular course re-enrolls in that course and receives an evaluative symbol as defined in section 55023.

  (2) “Substandard academic work” means course work for which the grading symbols “D,” “F,” “FW,” “NP” or “NC” (as defined in sections 55023 and 55030) have been recorded.

  (c) The policies and procedures adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) may:

    (1) designate certain types of courses as “repeatable courses” consistent with the requirements of section 55041;

    (2) allow a student to repeat a course in an effort to alleviate substandard academic work consistent with the requirements of section 55042;

    (3) permit or require a student to repeat a course due to significant lapse of time consistent with the requirements of section 55043;

    (4) permit a student to repeat a portion of a variable unit open-entry/open-exit course which the student previously completed only under the circumstances described in section 55044;

    (5) permit a student to repeat a course which is not designated as a repeatable course, regardless of whether or not substandard academic work was previously recorded, where the district determines, consistent with section 55045, that there are extenuating circumstances which justify the repetition;

    (6) permit a student to repeat a course in occupational work experience under the circumstances described in section 55253. When an occupational work experience course is repeated pursuant to that section, the grade received each time shall be included for purposes of calculating the student’s grade point average.

    (7) permit a student with a disability to repeat a special class for students with disabilities any number of times based on an individualized determination that such repetition is required as a disability-related accommodation for that particular student for one of the reasons specified in section 56029. The district policy may allow the previous grade and credit to be disregarded in computing the student’s GPA each time the course is repeated.
(d) When course repetition occurs pursuant to this section, the student's permanent academic record shall clearly indicate any courses repeated using an appropriate symbol and be annotated in such a manner that all work remains legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

(e) Notwithstanding the limits set forth above, apportionment will be limited as set forth in section 58161.


3. Section 55042 of article 4 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55042. Course Repetition to Alleviate Substandard Academic Work.

(a) The district policies and procedures on course repetition adopted pursuant to section 55040 may permit a student to repeat a course in an effort to alleviate substandard academic work.

(b) If a student repeats a course which is not designated as a repeatable course and receives a satisfactory grade, then he or she may not repeat the course again pursuant to this section and any further repetition of the course must be authorized by another provision of this division. If a student repeats the course and receives another substandard grade, the district policy may permit the student to repeat the course one additional time in an effort to alleviate substandard work. District policy may permit a student to petition to repeat a course for which three substandard grades have been assigned, provided apportionment is not claimed pursuant to section 58161.5. The first two substandard grades may be excluded in computing the student’s GPA if the student repeats the class two or more times.

(c) If a student repeats a repeatable course and a substandard grade has been recorded, district policy may allow the previous grade and credit to be disregarded provided that no additional repetitions are permitted beyond those limits specified in section 55041(c)(6). No more than two substandard grades may be alleviated pursuant to this section.

(d) Notwithstanding section 55041, policies and procedures related to course repetition to alleviate substandard academic work shall:

(1) permit repetition of any course which was taken in an accredited college or university and for which substandard academic work is recorded;

(2) indicate any specific courses or categories of courses where repetition pursuant to this section is not permitted; and

(3) in determining transfer of a student's credits, honor similar, prior course repetition actions by other accredited colleges and universities.

Section 58161 of article 5 of subchapter 2 of chapter 9 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 58161. Apportionment for Course Repetition Enrollment.

A community college district may claim the attendance of students who repeat-enroll in credit courses for state apportionment only if so authorized by this section and if all other requirements of this chapter are satisfied. For purposes of this section an enrollment occurs when a student receives an evaluative or nonevaluative symbol pursuant to section 55023.

(a) Where substandard academic work (as defined in section 55040) has been recorded for the attendance of a student in a credit course, apportionment may be claimed for a maximum of two repetitions of the course to alleviate substandard work pursuant to section 55042.

(b) The attendance of students in legally mandated training as provided in section 55041 may be claimed for state apportionment without limitation.

(c) The attendance of students in credit activity courses, and other courses described in subdivision (c) of section 55041, may be claimed for state apportionment for a maximum of four semesters or six quarters (the original enrollment and three semesters or five quarters of repeated enrollment). For purposes of this subdivision, semesters and quarters include summer sessions and intersessions. This limitation applies even if the student receives a substandard grade during one or more of the enrollments in such a course or petitions for repetition due to special circumstances as provided in section 55045.

(d) The attendance of a student with a disability may be claimed for state apportionment each time the student repeats a credit special class as a disability-related accommodation which is justified by one of the circumstances described in section 56029.

(e) The attendance of a student repeating a credit course by petition pursuant to section 55045 may be claimed for state apportionment for a maximum of two repetitions.

(f) The attendance of a student repeating a credit course because the district determines pursuant to of section 55043 that there has been a significant lapse of time since the student previously took the course may be counted for only one repetition beyond the prior enrollment.

(g) State apportionment may be claimed for the attendance of a student repeating a portion of a variable unit open entry/open exit credit course only to the extent that repetition of such courses is permitted pursuant to section 55044.

(h) The attendance of a student repeating a cooperative work experience course pursuant to section 55253 may be claimed for state apportionment without limitation.

(a) A district may claim state apportionment for attendance of students for enrollments totaling a maximum of three semesters or five quarters, including summer sessions and intersessions, per credit course and if all other requirements of this chapter are satisfied. For purposes of this section, enrollments include any combination of withdrawals and repetitions.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a) of this section, a district may claim state apportionment for one additional enrollment if all other requirements of this chapter are met and only in the following circumstances:
The attendance of a student repeating a credit course because the district determines pursuant to section 55043 that there has been a significant lapse of time since the student previously took the course.

(2) The attendance of a student repeating a credit course pursuant to section 55045 due to extenuating circumstances, if such credit course is not designated as repeatable pursuant to section 55041(c).

(c) Notwithstanding subdivisions (a), (b) and (d) of this section, a district may claim state apportionment for students’ enrollments in credit courses without limitation if all other requirements of this chapter are met and in the following circumstances:

(1) The attendance of a student in legally mandated training as provided in section 55041(b).

(2) The attendance of a student with a disability may be claimed for state apportionment each time the student repeats a credit special class as a disability-related accommodation which is justified by one of the circumstances described in section 56029.

(3) The attendance of a student repeating a portion of a variable unit open entry/open exit credit course may be counted for state apportionment only to the extent that repetition of such courses is permitted pursuant to section 55044.

(4) The attendance of a student repeating a cooperative work experience course pursuant to section 55253 may be claimed for state apportionment without limitation.

(5) The attendance of a student withdrawing as a result of extraordinary conditions pursuant to section 55024(a)(10).

(6) The attendance of a student receiving a military withdrawal (“MW”) pursuant to section 55024(d)(1).

(d) Notwithstanding subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) of this section, a district may claim state apportionment for students’ enrollments in credit courses designated as repeatable as provided in section 55041(c) for a maximum of four semesters or six quarters. This limitation applies even if a student receives a substandard grade during one or more of the enrollments in such a course or petitions for repetition due to special circumstances as provided in section 55045.

(i) To the extent permitted by article 4 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6, a district may permit repetition enrollment in of credit courses beyond the limits set forth in this section, but such additional repetitions enrollments may not be claimed for state apportionment.


5. Section 58161.5 of article 5 of subchapter 2 of chapter 9 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is repealed:

§ 58161.5. Apportionment for Re-Enrollment After Withdrawal.

Notwithstanding section 58161 or any other provision of law, a community college district may not claim apportionment for the attendance of a student in a credit course if the student withdraws from the course and a “W” symbol, as defined in section 55023, is
assigned to the student and the “W” symbol has previously been assigned to that student for that same course at colleges within the district on four or more occasions.


ATTACHMENT 2

UPDATED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS CREDIT COURSE REPETITION AND WITHDRAWAL REGULATIONS
Section 58161

Originally proposed section 58161(c):

Subdivision (c) sets forth those circumstances in which a district may claim apportionment without limitation (and as otherwise authorized). Subdivision (d) has been added to the list of subdivisions to which this allowance is an exception.

Originally proposed section 58161(d):

Subdivision (d) has been renumbered, section 58161(e).

Newly proposed Section 58161(d)

Existing subdivision (c) of section 58161 is proposed to be moved to proposed subdivision (d) with minor non-substantive technical changes to continue to allow districts to receive apportionment for students’ enrollments in courses designated as repeatable within the meaning of section 55041, subdivision (c), up to four times. This was inadvertently changed in the originally proposed changes to section 58161.
Summary and Response to Comments Received During the Initial Notice Period of April 28, 2011, through June 16, 2011, Inclusive.

Official Notice of proposed changes to the California Code of Regulations, title 5, regarding apportionment limits for credit course enrollment, repetition and withdrawal was published on April 28, 2011. The original proposed text was made available for public comment for at least 45 days from April 28, 2011, through June 16, 2011. The Notice specified the process to comment on the proposed changes. One written comment was received during the comment period. A public hearing was held during the Board of Governors Meeting on May 9, 2011, at the Chancellor’s Office. Comments from two people were heard. Pursuant to Standing Order 206, subdivision (b)(3), the Chancellor’s Office has summarized all written and oral comments and Proposed Responses below for adoption by the Board.

Comments Received During the Public Hearing

Leslie Smith (Associate Vice Chancellor, Government Relations, City College of San Francisco): During the public comment period on May 9th, Associate Vice Chancellor Smith explained that the proposed regulatory change is a “situation of apples and oranges.” For basic skills students she believes it is about building expertise and competence. She indicated that at City College of San Francisco (CCSF) there are 9,500 students taking basic skills in a semester. Of the 9,500 students, she indicated only 130 of those repeat a course for the 4th time. She contends that it is less than 1 percent of their population. She indicated that CCSF department chairs and faculty are absolutely committed to helping those students who persist to be successful. The last thing they want to do is to no longer be able to serve those students who are still committed despite the hardship of trying to succeed. Just because they are not succeeding in a math or English course, they are still succeeding in other classes. She stated that the CCC’s have never set a policy that does not provide an alternative for these students. It’s contrary to what community colleges do. It’s also less than 1 percent of community college students.

She expressed concerns about the English course outcome data provided in the Board agenda item. She believes that 80 percent of students who attempted on the 4th try completed based on her review of the charts provided. She contends that it’s worth reaching out to these students because they are likely successful in other courses or they wouldn’t be persisting. She believes there are many issues that need to be explored before we cut off our students.

Response: The proposed regulations allow for a student to take a class three times, with a process of appeal to obtain permission from the college to take the course a fourth time with the college able to claim apportionment. Beyond a fourth enrollment, if approved by the college, there are many exemptions that a student could qualify for that would enable them to take the class.
additional times, such as military deployment, special courses for disabled students, and legally mandated training. The goal is to have the college intervene early when a student is struggling to pass a class to help direct them to critical support services or additional academic advisement. Nothing in the proposed regulations would preclude a college from allowing the student to take the course beyond three enrollments (or four depending on whether the college has granted the exception request).

In response to concerns about the data presented on May 9th, Chancellor’s Office Technology, Research and Information Systems staff were able to run an updated MIS data request that provides a clearer picture of student course outcomes for repeated enrollments. The data continues to show that successful course completion declines the more times a student repeats the same class. This data is included as Attachment 3.

Mark Valenzuela (Student Senate for California Community Colleges): During the public comment period on May 9th, Mr. Valenzuela indicated that the Student Senate supports the proposed changes because it maximizes the number of students being able to access classes.

Response: Agree

Written Comments Received During the Public Comment Period

Allyson Joye (Professor, ESL, ESL Department Co-Chair, American River College): “I fully support this proposal. As a professor, I get quite frustrated when I see that some students repeat a class 2-3 times and/or enroll in and then withdraw from a class several times. Most importantly, this denies access to other students and should not be allowed for that reason alone. My suspicion is that there are also situations where students benefit financially from the current policy which allows them to be students semester after semester even though they are not making academic progress. As a tax payer, I cannot support a policy that encourages such a waste of our tax dollars.”

Response: Agree
## ATTACHMENT 4

Data on Student Repeats and Withdrawals from the Same Course

### Methodology

The cohort analyzed consists of all credit course enrollment records ever reported in English and Mathematics from 1992-93 through 2009-2010. The course TOP code was used to determine the discipline. The enrollments reported are for non-repeatable, credit courses and include remedial, degree-applicable, and transferrable courses.

### ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Grade A, B, C, P</th>
<th>Grade D, F</th>
<th>DR, W</th>
<th>Total Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Enrollment</td>
<td>6,846,046</td>
<td>1,541,778</td>
<td>2,076,682</td>
<td>10,644,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Enrollment</td>
<td>658,915</td>
<td>272,862</td>
<td>377,506</td>
<td>1,309,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Enrollment</td>
<td>116,546</td>
<td>56,994</td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td>259,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Enrollment</td>
<td>23,872</td>
<td>12,831</td>
<td>22,290</td>
<td>58,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Enrollment</td>
<td>11,671</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>15,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th+ Enrollment</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>7,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Grade A, B, C, P</th>
<th>Grade D, F</th>
<th>DR, W</th>
<th>Total Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Enrollment</td>
<td>5,915,078</td>
<td>2,000,264</td>
<td>2,689,648</td>
<td>10,604,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Enrollment</td>
<td>853,473</td>
<td>480,896</td>
<td>559,087</td>
<td>1,893,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Enrollment</td>
<td>179,461</td>
<td>117,651</td>
<td>139,881</td>
<td>436,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Enrollment</td>
<td>39,990</td>
<td>29,762</td>
<td>38,963</td>
<td>108,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Enrollment</td>
<td>10,039</td>
<td>8,311</td>
<td>12,155</td>
<td>30,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th+ Enrollment</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>15,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE TITLE 5 REGULATIONS: NONCREDIT COURSE AND PROGRAM APPROVAL (SECTIONS 55150, 55151, 55152, 55153, 55154, AND 55155)

FIRST READING (PUBLIC HEARING)
Presentation: Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Division
Stephanie Low, Dean, Curriculum & Instruction, Academic Affairs Division

Item 4.1

Issue

This item proposes changes to regulations as they relate to noncredit course and program approval in title 5, sections 55150 through 55155, inclusive.

Background

For several years, conviction and evidence have been growing that current regulations in title 5 relating to noncredit course and program approval are in need of clarity. In April 2010, the Curriculum Inventory was launched to allow the colleges to submit noncredit courses and programs electronically to the Chancellor’s Office. With the development of the Curriculum Inventory, the need to clarify existing title 5 regulations as they relate to noncredit courses and programs became evident. Current regulations are confusing and clarifying certain sections allows for noncredit courses and programs to have a distinct definition. Other sections that are no longer necessary are recommended for repeal.

From June 2010 through March 2011, conversations have taken place with the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC), Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE) and noncredit faculty groups, all of whom support these title 5 proposed changes. In December 2010, SACC reviewed proposed recommendations to revise the title 5 regulations on noncredit course and program approval. In February 2011, the Academic Senate and ACCE reviewed and commented on the proposed title 5 changes. The proposed revisions were reviewed by Consultation Council on May 19, 2011. Consultation Council agreed with the recommendation to forward to the Board of Governors.

Analysis

The proposed revisions clarify certain sections and repeal others yet, at the same time, the approval process remains the same. All courses and programs, including High School noncredit courses, must
still be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. The delegated authority to the local college/district remains the same. Funding is not affected by these proposed changes and is still based on positive attendance. The qualifying factors for enhanced funding noncredit programs, those that result in a certificate of completion or certificate of competency, remain the same.

Sections 55152 and 55153 may be repealed as the instructions have been condensed and put into revised sections 55150 and 55151. The significant proposed change is that the threshold of 288 hours of instruction has been removed, which was a confusing issue to all involved.

**Recommended Action**

The proposed regulations are presented to the Board of Governors for a first reading. The Board of Governors should hold a public hearing and consider any testimony which is offered. It is anticipated that the regulations will be presented to the Board for final action at its September meeting.

*Staff: Joanne Vorhies, Specialist, Academic Affairs*
1. Section 55150 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55150. Approval of Noncredit Courses and Programs.
   (a) Each noncredit course shall be approved by the Chancellor in accordance with this article on forms provided by the Chancellor. Failure to comply with the provisions of this article may result in termination of approval.
   (b) Noncredit programs shall be approved by the Chancellor as provided in sections 55152, 55153 and 55154 on forms provided by the Chancellor. An approval is effective until the program or implementation of the program is discontinued or modified in any substantial way. The Chancellor may evaluate a noncredit program, after its approval, on the basis of factors listed in sections 55152, 55153 or 55154, as applicable. If on the basis of such an evaluation the Chancellor determines that the program should no longer be offered, the Chancellor may terminate the approval and determine the effective date of termination.
   (c) Course outlines of record for all noncredit courses prepared in accordance with subdivision (c) of section 55002 shall be on file in the community college offering the course.
   (d) Authorities of each community college maintaining noncredit courses shall keep such current records and reports as may be required by the Chancellor.
   (e) In order to be eligible for enhanced funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5, a career development or college preparation noncredit course must be part of a program or sequence of courses approved by the Chancellor pursuant to sections 55151 or 55152.
   (d) The following noncredit educational programs shall be approved by the Chancellor:
   (1) Noncredit educational programs that qualify for enhanced funding;
   (2) Adult high school diploma programs as specified in section 55154; and
   (3) Those noncredit educational programs that are otherwise required by law to be approved by the Chancellor.
   (e) Noncredit educational programs requiring approval of the Chancellor shall be approved by the Chancellor in accordance with this article and on forms provided by the Chancellor.
   Approval of a noncredit educational program is effective until either:
   (1) The noncredit educational program or implementation of the noncredit educational program is discontinued or modified in any substantial way; or
(2) The Chancellor evaluates the noncredit educational program after its approval on the basis of factors listed in sections 55151 or 55154, as applicable. If the Chancellor determines that the noncredit educational program should no longer be offered based on the evaluation, the Chancellor may terminate the approval and determine the effective date of termination.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

2. Section 55151 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55151. Career Development and College Preparation.

A noncredit course involving career development or college preparation will be eligible for enhanced funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5 if it satisfies the requirements set forth in subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) below.

(a) The course is approved by the college curriculum committee and the district governing board pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 55002 and by the Chancellor’s Office pursuant to section 55150 and is part of either:

(1) A short-term vocational program providing less than 288 hours of instruction which the Chancellor, in consultation with the Employment Development Department, has determined to have high employment potential. In making this determination, the Chancellor shall utilize job demand data provided by the Employment Development Department. If current job demand data in the relevant field is not available from the Employment Development Department, the Chancellor and the Employment Development Department may rely upon other data submitted by the college.

(2) A noncredit educational program or sequence of courses involving:

(A) Courses in elementary and secondary basic skills;

(B) Workforce preparation courses in the basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, mathematics, decision-making, and problem solving skills that are necessary to participate in job-specific technical training; or

(C) Courses in English as a second language and vocational English as a second language.

(b) The noncredit educational program or sequence of courses is designed to result in either:

(1) A noncredit certificate of completion leading to improved employability or job opportunities; or

(2) A noncredit certificate of competency in a recognized career field articulated with degree-applicable coursework, completion of an associate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate institution. A certificate of competency in a recognized career field may be articulated with degree-applicable coursework, an associate degree, or transfer to a baccalaureate institution by means of nondegree-applicable coursework which may be completed prior to or taken concurrently with degree-applicable or transferable coursework, that prepares students to take nondegree-applicable credit course work,
including basic skills and English as a second language; or to take degree-applicable credit coursework leading to one or more of the following:

(A) completion of a credit certificate;
(B) an associate in arts degree; or
(C) transfer to a baccalaureate institution.

(c) Each The noncredit educational program or sequence of courses in which enhanced funding is sought must be submitted to and approved by the Chancellor. Each application for approval shall include a list of required courses to be included in the program or sequence of courses, course outlines for each course, and an explanation of how the program or sequence of courses is designed to lead students to one of the outcomes described in subdivision (b). For short-term vocational programs, the application shall also include an analysis of labor market need or job availability. Applications for approval shall include an explanation of how the educational program is designed to lead students to one of the outcomes described in subdivision (b) and all of the following:

1. a list of required courses to be included in the educational program;
2. the minimum number of hours required for completion of the educational program;
3. course outlines of record for all courses in the educational program;
4. the catalog description of the educational program; and
5. for short-term vocational programs, an analysis of labor market need or job availability.

(d) The Chancellor shall develop forms and procedures for electronic submission of applications for approval.

(e) If the Chancellor approves a sequence of courses or a short-term vocational program pursuant to this section, the sequence of courses or program may not be subsequently modified by the inclusion of additional courses unless the course or courses to be added are of one of the types listed in subdivision (a) and have themselves been individually approved by the Chancellor pursuant to section 55150.

(f) Under no circumstances may a district separate an existing noncredit course which provides less than one hundred and ten (110) hours of instruction into two or more courses for the purpose of forming a noncredit educational program sequence of courses to satisfy the requirements of this section.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a particular student from taking additional degree-applicable coursework, pursuing an associate degree, or pursuing transfer to a baccalaureate institution in addition to or instead of seeking immediate employment.

(h) For purposes of this article, the term “certificate of completion” means a document confirming that a student has completed a noncredit educational program or sequence of noncredit courses that prepares him or her to progress in a career path or to undertake degree-applicable or nondegree-applicable credit courses. The document must include the name of the certificate and the date awarded, be identified by a Taxonomy of Programs (T.O.P.) Code number and program discipline, identify the goal of the program, and list the courses completed by the student.

(i) For purposes of this article, the term “certificate of competency” means a document confirming that a student enrolled in a noncredit educational program or sequence of noncredit courses has demonstrated achievement of a set of competencies that prepares him or her to progress in a career path or to undertake degree-applicable or nondegree-
applicable credit courses. The document must include the name of the certificate and the date awarded, be identified by a T.O.P. Code number and program discipline, and list the relevant competencies achieved by the student.

(j) Content and assessment standards for certificates shall be defined by the local curriculum committee. The review of noncredit certificate programs by the curriculum committee shall review noncredit educational programs leading to a certificate be conducted using the same standards as applied to credit educational programs leading to a certificate as set forth in section 55070, with respect to academic integrity, consistency with college mission, meeting a demonstrated need and program feasibility.

(k) Each noncredit educational program shall be approved by the governing board of the district.

(l) Certificates for noncredit educational programs may be awarded to students who have earned them on behalf of the governing board of the district by any appropriate district official or by a particular department or division pursuant to a delegation of authority from the governing board to students who have earned them.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

3. Section 55152 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is repealed:

6.55152. Short-Term Vocational Programs Providing 288 Hours or More of Instruction.

(a) Before offering any noncredit short-term vocational program providing 288 hours or more of instruction on or after June 30, 2008, the governing board of a community college district shall obtain approval of the program pursuant to this section. Each course which is to be part of the program must be approved by the college curriculum committee pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 55002.

(b) The Chancellor, in consultation with the Employment Development Department, must determine that the program has high employment potential. In making this determination, the Chancellor shall utilize job demand data provided by the Employment Development Department. If current job demand data in the relevant field is not available from the Employment Development Department, the Chancellor and the Employment Development Department may rely upon other data submitted by the college.

(c) If a district seeks to claim enhanced funding for the program pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5, the program must also be designed to lead to one of the types of certificates described in subdivision (b) of section 55151.

(d) Applications shall include all of the following:

(1) a list of required courses to be included in the program;
(2) course outlines for all courses in the program;
(3) a statement of the goals and objectives of the program;
(4) a description of the relationship of the proposed program to other programs;
(5) a discussion of the possible impact of the proposed program on nearby community colleges; and
(6) an analysis of labor market need or job availability.

(e) The Chancellor shall develop forms and procedures for review and approval of such programs. If a program was approved pursuant to section 55151 prior to June 30, 2007, information provided with the prior application need not be resubmitted.

(f) If a program is approved by the Chancellor pursuant to this section, the program may be subsequently modified by the addition of other noncredit courses without the necessity to obtain separate approval of such courses from the Chancellor.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a particular student to complete a certificate or to characterize failure to do so as a negative outcome.

(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a particular student from taking additional degree-applicable coursework, pursuing an associate degree, or pursuing transfer to a baccalaureate institution in addition to or instead of seeking immediate employment.

Note: Authority cited: sections 66700, 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code.
Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

4. Section 55153 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of regulations is repealed:

§ 55153. Other Noncredit Programs Providing 288 Hours or More of Instruction.

(a) Before offering any noncredit program on or after June 30, 2008, which provides 288 hours or more of instruction in any area of noncredit instruction other than those covered by sections 55152 and 55154, the governing board of a community college district shall obtain approval of the program pursuant to this section. Each course which is to be part of the program must be approved by the college curriculum committee pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 55002.

(b) Applications shall include all of the following:
(1) a list of courses to be included in the program;
(2) course outlines for all courses in the program;
(3) documentation of the need or demand for the program;
(4) a statement of the goals and objectives of the program;
(5) a description of the relationship of the proposed program to other programs; and
(6) a discussion of the possible impact of the proposed program on nearby colleges.

(c) The Chancellor shall develop forms and procedures for review and approval of programs submitted for approval pursuant to this section.

(d) A program approved pursuant to this section will only be eligible for enhanced funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5 if it also satisfies the requirements of section 55151 and the application so demonstrates. If an application for approval pursuant to section 55151 was filed prior to application for program approval under this section, materials submitted with the section 55151 application need not be resubmitted.
(e) If a program is approved by the Chancellor pursuant to this section, the program may be subsequently modified by the addition of other noncredit courses without the necessity to obtain separate approval of such courses from the Chancellor even if the program is also approved for enhanced funding pursuant to section 55151.

(f) A district may, but is not required to, award a noncredit certificate pursuant to section 55155 to students who complete such a program, provided that such a certificate may not be designated or referred to as a certificate of achievement, a certificate of completion or a certificate of competency unless the program is also approved for enhanced funding pursuant to section 55151.

Note: Authority cited: sections 66700, 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

5. Section 55154 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55154. Adult High School Diploma Programs.

(a) Before offering any noncredit course as part of a high school diploma program on or after June 30, 2009, the governing board of a community college district shall obtain approval of its high school diploma program as provided in section 55150.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term “high school diploma program” means an organized sequence of noncredit courses designed to meet the needs of adult learners which leads to a high school diploma which is awarded by the community college district or jointly by the district and a high school.

(c) The application for approval shall include all of the following:

(1) A statement that both the local curriculum committee(s) and the district governing board have reviewed and approved the high school diploma program.

(2) Information demonstrating that there exists demand for the college to offer a high school diploma program for adult learners in the area.

(3) Coursework requirements and content standards that meet or exceed those described in subdivision (e).

(4) Comprehensive descriptions of program organization, instructional support services, student services, facilities and ongoing staffing efforts to demonstrate that the district has the resources to maintain the high school diploma program.

(5) A copy of the proposed catalog description.

(6) Requirements or conditions by which a student can obtain high school credit by examination or by successfully completing college degree-applicable or nondegree-applicable credit course work and any alternative means for students to complete the prescribed course of study.

(7) A description of the student assessment procedures for academic placement in the program and a description of how the district will evaluate student progress.

(d) Once a program is approved by the Chancellor pursuant to this section, the program may be subsequently modified by the addition of other noncredit courses without the
necessity to obtain separate approval of such courses from the Chancellor even if the program has also been approved for enhanced funding pursuant to section 55151.

(e)(d)(1) The governing board of a community college district shall confer a high school diploma upon a student who has satisfactorily completed at least 160 credits of high school level coursework and who has demonstrated competence in reading, writing, and mathematics at a level generally accepted as appropriate for award of a high school diploma. The required 160 credits of high school level course work must be fulfilled in a core curriculum consisting of courses in the categories described in paragraph (2) and accepted toward the diploma by a college within the district (as shown in its catalog). A college may accept toward satisfaction of this requirement courses that were completed at an accredited high school or college that would reasonably be expected to meet or exceed the standards of this section, provided that at least 20 of the total 160 required high school credits must be completed in residence at the college granting the diploma.

(2) The curriculum must include the indicated minimum number of high school credits in each of the areas listed below. Each course shall be of a duration sufficient to permit a student to master the content of the course as specified in the content standards described in paragraph (3).

(A) Natural Sciences. A minimum of 20 high school credits shall be required in natural sciences, including biological and physical sciences. Courses in the natural sciences are those which examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. To satisfy the core curriculum requirement in natural sciences, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method, and encourage an understanding of the relationships between science and other human activities. This category may include introductory or integrative courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, general physical science, geology, meteorology, oceanography, physical geography, physical anthropology, physics and other scientific disciplines.

(B) Social and Behavioral Sciences. A minimum of 30 high school credits shall be required in social and behavioral sciences. Courses in the social and behavioral sciences are those which focus on people as members of society. To satisfy the core curriculum requirement in social and behavioral sciences, a course shall be designed to develop an awareness of the method of inquiry used by the social and behavioral sciences. It shall be designed to stimulate critical thinking about the ways people act and have acted in response to their societies and should promote appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate. Each student shall be required to complete coursework that addresses United States history and geography; world history, geography, and culture; American government and civics; and economics. This category may also include introductory or integrative survey courses in cultural anthropology, cultural geography, political science, psychology, sociology and related disciplines, as well as additional courses in economics, American government, United States history, and world history.

(C) Humanities. A minimum of 10 high school credits shall be required in humanities. Courses in the humanities are those which study the cultural activities and artistic expressions of human beings. To satisfy the core curriculum requirement in the humanities, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an awareness of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and the world around them in artistic and cultural creation and help the student develop aesthetic
understanding and an ability to make value judgments. Each student shall be required to complete one course in visual or performing arts or foreign language. This category may also include introductory or integrative courses in literature, philosophy, and religion, as well as additional courses in the arts, and foreign languages. For the purposes of satisfying the requirement specified in this paragraph, a course in American Sign Language shall be deemed a course in foreign language.

(D) English. A minimum of 30 high school credits shall be required in English. Courses in English are those which develop the principles and applications of language toward logical thought, clear and precise expression and critical evaluation. To satisfy the core curriculum requirement in English, a course shall be designed to develop reading, writing, and verbal expression skills as applicable to the needs and interests of an adult. Such courses may include introductory or integrative courses in literature and English grammar, writing strategies, and mechanics.

(E) Mathematics. A minimum of 20 high school credits shall be required in mathematics. Courses in mathematics develop the ability to reason with and apply mathematical operations and principles. To satisfy the core curriculum requirement in mathematics, a course shall be designed to help a student gain facility in the operations of mathematics as well as its practical applications. Such courses may include algebra, geometry, applied mathematics, and calculus.

(3) Course content standards for the coursework described in subdivision (2) must meet or exceed the standards for the high school curriculum established by the California State Board of Education.

(f) Notwithstanding the requirements of this section, any student enrolled in a high school diploma program prior to June 30, 2009, may receive a high school diploma based on completion of the curriculum required for the program as set forth in the college catalog in effect at the time the student first enrolled in the program; provided the student remains continuously enrolled without a break of more than one primary term subsequent to the Spring 2009 term.

(g) In order for a high school diploma program to qualify for enhanced noncredit funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5, the application for approval must satisfy the requirements of section 55151.

(h) For the purposes of this section, a noncredit course awarding 10 high school credits must be designed to require a minimum of 144 hours of lecture, study or laboratory work.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 60851, 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

6. Section 55155 of article 2 of subchapter 2 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55155. Noncredit Certificates.

(a) Any noncredit educational program leading to a certificate must be approved by the college curriculum committee and the district governing board and all courses in the
program must be individually approved by the Chancellor pursuant to section 55150, except where a course is subsequently added to a program after it is approved by the Chancellor pursuant to sections 55152, 55153 or 55154.

(b) All noncredit educational programs or sequences of courses leading to a noncredit certificate of completion or certificate of competency are subject to approval must be approved by the Chancellor pursuant to sections 55151 or 55152.

(c) If a district does not seek enhanced funding for a noncredit educational program or sequence of noncredit courses, or the program or sequence of courses it does not qualify for enhanced funding pursuant to section 55151, a noncredit educational program leading to a certificate may be established by the district without approval by the Chancellor except as required in sections 55152, 55153 or 55154. A district may award a noncredit certificate to a student completing such a noncredit educational program, but may not designate or refer to it as a certificate of completion or a certificate of competency in a recognized career field pursuant to section 55151.

(d) A noncredit certificate awarded to a student completing a noncredit educational program may not be referred to as a certificate of achievement regardless of its length or whether or not it has been approved by the Chancellor.

(e) A description of each approved noncredit educational program shall be included in the college catalog.

(f) Provisions of this section regarding the naming or designation of certificates shall become effective for the Fall 2008 term.

ATTACHMENT 2

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO NONCREDIT COURSE AND NONCREDIT PROGRAM APPROVAL REGULATIONS
TITLE 5 SECTIONS 55150, 55151, 55152, 55153, 55154, 55155

General

Non-substantive, technical changes are proposed throughout for clarity and consistency.

Proposed section 55150 (a):

The word “all” is proposed to strengthen the point that every noncredit course must receive Chancellor’s Office approval. The second sentence is proposed to be added to make clear that college districts must comply with the requirements of the article or in the Chancellor’s Office may terminate approval of noncredit courses.

Proposed section 55150 (b):

Proposed subdivision (b) is prior subdivision (c). Propose adding “of record” to course outline for consistency and clarity. Prior subdivision (b) has been rewritten for clarity and is proposed subdivision (e).

Proposed section 55150 (c):

Proposed subdivision (c) is prior subdivision (d), no other changes are proposed.

Proposed section 55150 (d):

Proposed subdivision (d) is prior subdivision (b) with the following modifications: propose deleting references to section 55152 and 55153 as those sections are proposed to be deleted in their entirety. Requirements from former sections 55152 and 55153 were moved here as (d)(1) – (3), which clearly define the types of noncredit Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) programs that must be approved the Chancellor’s Office. These programs are: programs that qualify for enhanced funding, adult high school programs and any other noncredit program required by law to be approved by the Chancellor, such as apprenticeships.
Proposed section 55150 (e):
Propose deleting existing subdivision (e) and references to sections 55151 and 55152 due to redundancy, as the proposed section 55150(a) requires that all noncredit courses must be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. Propose to add new language which clarifies circumstances on which a noncredit program can be terminated by the Chancellor.

Proposed section 55151 (a) (1):
Propose deleting the requirement that a short-term vocation program be only those providing less than 288 hours of instruction which is currently causing confusion in noncredit programs. There is no legal justification for a noncredit program to show just cause for set hours. In addition, the threshold of 288 hours has no relevance to existing noncredit programs offered by the community colleges.

Proposed section 55151 (a) (2):
Propose deleting “sequence of courses” and adding “noncredit educational program” for clarity and consistency because “educational program” is the proper term and is defined in section 55000 (g) as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.” This change is also made in proposed sections 55151(b), (c), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k).

Proposed section 55151 (b) (2):
Propose to clarify the definition of certificate of competency in order to explain that students commonly progress from noncredit course work to nondegree-applicable credit course work, which then prepares them to take degree-applicable credit course work. This pathway may lead to completion of a credit certificate, an associate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate institution.

Proposed section 55151 (c):
Propose adding “in which enhanced funding is sought” allows for the remaining portion of (c) to be deleted with the further additional language of “applications for approval shall include:” and clear criteria based on current practice and existing section 55002(c) on noncredit course standards are detailed in subsections.
Proposed section 55151 (d):
Propose deleting electronic since all courses and programs are now submitted electronically through the CCC Curriculum Inventory.

Proposed section 55151 (j):
Propose to delete wording and replace with new wording to clarify that noncredit programs leading to a certificate as explained are reviewed by the local curriculum committee using the same standards applied to credit certificates in section 55070.

Proposed section 55151 (l):
Propose clarifying that noncredit program certificates may be awarded by the governing board of the district only to students who have earned the noncredit certificate.

Proposed section 55152:
Propose to eliminate this section due to the strengthening and clarity of proposed section 55150. The requirements contained in this section have been incorporated into the proposed section 55151(c). Eliminate the threshold of 288 hours, because there is no legal justification for a noncredit program to show just cause for set hours and “288 hours” has no relevance to existing noncredit programs offered by the community colleges.

Proposed section 55153:
Propose to eliminate this section due to the strengthening and clarity of proposed section 55150. The requirements contained in this section have been incorporated into the proposed section 55151(c). Eliminate the threshold of 288 hours, because there is no legal justification for a noncredit program to show just cause for set hours and “288 hours” has no relevance to existing noncredit programs offered by the community colleges.

Proposed section 55154 (d):
Propose to eliminate this sub-division as approval of all noncredit courses is now required in proposed section 55150(a).
Proposed section 55154 subdivision (d) (e) (f) and (g):

Propose to renumber from prior subdivisions (e) (f) (g) and (h), respectively.

Proposed section 55155 (a):

Propose revising to “noncredit educational program” for clarity and consistency because “educational program” is the proper term and is defined in section 55000 (g) as “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.” This change is also made in proposed sections 55155(b), (c), (d), and (e). Propose to delete language in regard to noncredit course approval, which is now required in proposed section 55150(a). Propose to remove references to sections 55152, 55153, and 55154(d). Similar changes are proposed in subdivisions 55155 (b) and (c).

Proposed section 55155 (c):

Propose revision to delegate authority to districts to approve a noncredit educational program that is not eligible for enhanced funding. This aligns with authority delegated to districts to approve credit certificates of fewer than 18 units (section 55070). In addition, propose eliminating reference to sections 55152 and 55153, which are being proposed to be deleted.

Proposed section 55155 (d):

Propose eliminating the word “noncredit” and using clarifying language in the section.
BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING LOCATIONS FOR 2012

FIRST READING
Presentation: Steve Bruckman, Executive Vice Chancellor Programs/General Counsel

Item 4.2

Issue

This item gives the Board the opportunity to discuss site locations for their meetings and to determine which date/s to have those meetings.

Conclusion

The Board of Governors will discuss locations and dates for offsite meetings in 2012.
UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FOUNDATION FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Dr. Paul Lanning, President/Chief Executive Officer
Foundation for California Community Colleges

Item 5.1

Issue

This item will present an update on the activities of the Foundation for California Community Colleges to the Board of Governors.
June 21, 2011

Overview: California Community Colleges Scholarship Endowment
Fundraising Status

Included in this board packet are the preliminary results of the California Community Colleges Scholarship Endowment fundraising campaign, as of June 20, 2011, with final results to be provided at the July 11 Board of Governors meeting.

The Endowment was launched in May 2008 with an unprecedented commitment from The Bernard Osher Foundation. This historic pledge included a $25 million lead gift, and the promise of another $25 million in match dollars for up to $50 million raised by June 30, 2011, resulting in a $100 million permanent scholarship fund. Since that time, much has happened within our state and our system, including drastic budget cuts, unprecedented economic challenges, and community colleges cutting back or even eliminating their foundations. The very fundraising arms responsible for raising dollars for initiatives such as this. Despite these challenges, California Community Colleges have made tremendous strides in this campaign.

The Endowment is expected to reach over $61.2 million by June 30—including the lead gift and match funds from the Osher Foundation—and will fund nearly 3,100 scholarships every year, forever. Additionally, a number of other significant milestones are worth mentioning:

- There has been a participation rate of nearly 75 percent of California Community Colleges actively raising funds for the Endowment over the past three years. Given the many economic challenges colleges have faced during this time, it is encouraging that so many were able to dedicate time and resources to this cause, which ultimately benefits students in need.
- Twenty-four colleges have met or exceeded their original fundraising goals, or are expected to do so by June 30.
- Already, $2.7 million in scholarship support has been awarded to students at every California Community College over the past two years, thanks to this Endowment.
- During the 2011-12 academic year, over $2.1 million in scholarships will be awarded.

Regardless of whether we meet the original goal of $100 million, California Community Colleges can be proud of the real difference that has already been made for the countless students benefiting from this initiative. For additional background on this initiative prior to the upcoming Board of Governors meeting, please visit www.SupportTheEndowment.org or contact the Foundation for California Community Colleges directly at endowment@foundationccc.org or 866.325.322, ext. 144.
### California Community Colleges Scholarship Endowment

**Fundraising by Colleges (as of June 20, 2011)**

*Final figures as of June 20 to be provided at July 2011 BOG Meeting.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Original Fundraising Target</th>
<th>Funds Raised to Date</th>
<th>Fundraising Progress</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda College of</td>
<td>$360,661</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Hancock College</td>
<td>$432,790</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American River College</td>
<td>$548,983</td>
<td>$50,240</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley College</td>
<td>$475,066</td>
<td>$86,560</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>$567,092</td>
<td>$567,092</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow College</td>
<td>$98,527</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley City College</td>
<td>$125,774</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte College</td>
<td>$145,682</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo College</td>
<td>$886,099</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada College</td>
<td>$177,988</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon College of the</td>
<td>$615,188</td>
<td>$465,525</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Community College</td>
<td>$315,548</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College</td>
<td>$131,127</td>
<td>$180,600</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffey College</td>
<td>$431,698</td>
<td>$13,335</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis College</td>
<td>$165,246</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos College</td>
<td>$151,388</td>
<td>$26,648</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastline Community College</td>
<td>$283,756</td>
<td>$277,456</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>$94,786</td>
<td>$166,434</td>
<td>170%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>$247,151</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain College</td>
<td>$63,525</td>
<td>$16,525</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos River College</td>
<td>$580,990</td>
<td>$8,053</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>$417,911</td>
<td>$26,329</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyranosky College</td>
<td>$396,825</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress College</td>
<td>$359,291</td>
<td>$95,328</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Anza College</td>
<td>$460,866</td>
<td>$287,085</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Anza College</td>
<td>$519,979</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccan College of the</td>
<td>$336,539</td>
<td>$336,539</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo Valley College</td>
<td>$663,960</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$294,327</td>
<td>$55,473</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte College**</td>
<td>$973,717</td>
<td>$1,068,268</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Valley College</td>
<td>$500,438</td>
<td>$7,376</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler College</td>
<td>$401,120</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton College**</td>
<td>$225,865</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton College</td>
<td>$577,676</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno City College</td>
<td>$376,233</td>
<td>$274,313</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton College***</td>
<td>$1,082,355</td>
<td>$165,662</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora College</td>
<td>$225,506</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden West College</td>
<td>$472,720</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont College</td>
<td>$548,530</td>
<td>$414,663</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell College</td>
<td>$327,134</td>
<td>$268,183</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley College</td>
<td>$297,839</td>
<td>$26,668</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Valley College</td>
<td>$356,422</td>
<td>$167,450</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Community College</td>
<td>$75,622</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen College</td>
<td>$350,310</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>$150,573</td>
<td>$68,100</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$65,285</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach City College</td>
<td>$928,107</td>
<td>$697,817</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$65,663</td>
<td>$150,047</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$128,917</td>
<td>$279</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$268,096</td>
<td>$113,577</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$650,591</td>
<td>$968</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>$207,427</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*California Community Colleges Scholarship Endowment Fundraising by Colleges continued on back*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Original Fundraising Target</th>
<th>Funds Raised to Date</th>
<th>Fundraising Progress</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade-Tech College</td>
<td>$905,577</td>
<td>$202,723</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>$448,545</td>
<td>$911</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Medanos College</td>
<td>$127,578</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira, College of</td>
<td>$195,781</td>
<td>$195,781</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino College</td>
<td>$116,384</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced College</td>
<td>$116,773</td>
<td>$88,384</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriam College</td>
<td>$185,660</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracosta College</td>
<td>$501,954</td>
<td>$581,935</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td>$286,804</td>
<td>$52,431</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto Junior College</td>
<td>$621,608</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula College</td>
<td>$855,728</td>
<td>$339,758</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark College</td>
<td>$275,460</td>
<td>$77,462</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Antonio College</td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
<td>$581,124</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Jacinto College</td>
<td>$450,375</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Valley College</td>
<td>$216,953</td>
<td>$48,352</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone College</td>
<td>$157,552</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Coast College</td>
<td>$781,219</td>
<td>$1,090</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard College</td>
<td>$1,927,755</td>
<td>$252,755</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde College</td>
<td>$91,122</td>
<td>$42,430</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar College</td>
<td>$569,299</td>
<td>$197,600</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena City College</td>
<td>$879,377</td>
<td>$1,448,850</td>
<td>179%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>$140,151</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood College of the</td>
<td>$753,342</td>
<td>$67,790</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside College</td>
<td>$410,967</td>
<td>$46,975</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo College</td>
<td>$371,040</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Community College</td>
<td>$1,191,201</td>
<td>$284,468</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City College</td>
<td>$769,961</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleback College</td>
<td>$671,175</td>
<td>$602,354</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Valley College</td>
<td>$415,595</td>
<td>$325,590</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego City College</td>
<td>$704,865</td>
<td>$720,083</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Mesa College</td>
<td>$769,200</td>
<td>$52,062</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Miramar College</td>
<td>$316,682</td>
<td>$37,328</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, City College of</td>
<td>$1,574,646</td>
<td>$1,351,784</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta College</td>
<td>$375,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose City College</td>
<td>$355,309</td>
<td>$9,018</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo College</td>
<td>$319,995</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana College</td>
<td>$1,494,515</td>
<td>$26,668</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara City College</td>
<td>$570,279</td>
<td>$676,679</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica College</td>
<td>$807,701</td>
<td>$807,701</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee Ross Junior College</td>
<td>$884,307</td>
<td>$888,307</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Canyon College</td>
<td>$376,944</td>
<td>$60,094</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana College of the</td>
<td>$352,169</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma College</td>
<td>$813,645</td>
<td>$18,450</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State College</td>
<td>$322,134</td>
<td>$64,500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou College of the</td>
<td>$103,918</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay College</td>
<td>$578,354</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern College</td>
<td>$821,265</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft College</td>
<td>$108,411</td>
<td>$94,218</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura College</td>
<td>$400,766</td>
<td>$523,274</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley College</td>
<td>$495,700</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills College of the</td>
<td>$87,024</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills College of the</td>
<td>$1,209,871</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>$62,356</td>
<td>$62,356</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley College</td>
<td>$403,560</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba College</td>
<td>$344,760</td>
<td>$177,774</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for California</td>
<td>$764,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>$4,860,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,181,741</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Gift:</strong></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match:</strong></td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Endowment:</strong></td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td><strong>$61,272,612</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Community Colleges Scholarship Endowment
FUNDRAISING BY COLLEGES

*Based on percentage of total PTEF 2007/08
**Includes Community College
***Includes Continuing Ed PTEF
Item 5.2

Issue

The Board will receive an update on developments related to the State Budget.
UPDATE OF THE 2012-13 SYSTEM BUDGET REQUEST

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Dan Troy, Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policy

Item 5.3

Issue

This item provides the Board with an update on the status of the 2012-13 System Budget Request.

Background

Education Code section 70901(b) (5) (A) directs the Board of Governors to prepare and adopt an annual System Budget Request. To help meet this statutory obligation each year, the Chancellor’s Office convenes a budget work group, comprised of many members and designees of the Consultation Council, other college representatives, and system office staff to work on principles and a blueprint of a budget request to present to the Governor in early September.

The workgroup met on June 10th to discuss the 2012-13 System Budget Request. A summary of this discussion was shared with Consultation Councils on June 16th. This same summary is provided below and should serve as the basis for the Board’s initial discussion on the system budget. Based on the recommendations/directions coming from the Board, the workgroup will reconvene in July/August to discuss in greater detail the budget request. Staff will share these discussions once more with Consultation Council in August and then return in September with recommendations for the Board to consider and adopt.

2012-13 Budget Request Summary

In our 2011-12 System Budget Request our highest priority was restoration of categorical program cuts to support student success, followed by backfill of recent unfunded cost of living allowances (COLAs), and growth funding as the third priority. General agreement exists on the need for the same items we requested last year: restoration of categorical program funding cuts, backfill of unfunded COLAs, and “growth” in the form of restoring base apportionment funding that has been cut (ranging from $350 million to as high $550 million, pending a final 2011-12 budget agreement). However, the priority order of these items has not been unanimously agreed-upon as yet.

In addition to the budget items mentioned above surrounding growth, cola and categorical funding restoration, there were several suggestions from the budget workgroup for new funding proposals.
These suggestions are summarized below:

Noncredit funding equalization – Senate Bill 361 established a category of Career Development and College Preparation Noncredit courses, which were envisioned to be funded at a higher rate than other noncredit courses. While partial funding was initially provided for this, the additional funding needed to reach the “state-supported credit rate” was never provided by the state. To reach this level would require $30 million.

Distance Education – While distance education courses have been growing steadily, they experience a higher withdrawal rate than face-to-face courses. A recommendation has been made to fund research to increase distance education retention rates, with funding of $5 million per year for 5 years through the Fund for Instructional Improvement, for a total of $25 million.

Possible funding needs that may arise out of the work of the Student Success Task Force. No dollar amount yet identified.

Possible new programs to focus on unemployment and/or returning veterans. No dollar amounts identified.

It was suggested that we prepare proposals to spend one-time funding that may be available. Some ideas for any possible one-time funding include funding to pay off existing mandate claims that currently exceed $300 million and funding for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment.

**Conclusion**

This item is presented to the Board for information only.
STATE AND FEDERAL UPDATE

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Marlene Garcia, Vice Chancellor of Government Relations

Item 5.4

Issue

The Board will be provided with an update on both state and federal activities. The state discussion will include an overview of the status of legislation monitored by the Chancellor’s Office.

Staff: Michael Magee, Director/Administrator, State Government Relations

Attachments
State Legislative Update

Overview

The legislature has continued budget negotiations with the Governor still not reaching agreement on a two-thirds vote budget package that includes tax extensions. Meanwhile, Legislative Policy Committees continue to meet to hear bills from the other house.

Major Policy Issues

There are several key bills that are being considered by the Legislature this year that have raised significant policy issues, particularly in light of the current fiscal environment. **Assembly Bill 515 (Brownley)** establishes a pilot community college extension program. The local community college governing board would be permitted to establish a pilot extension program that offers credit courses and set student fees that cover the full cost of instruction. The bill also specifies that collective bargaining and Title 5 regulations would still apply.

Another bill, **AB 160 (Portantino)**, would relax specified restrictions on K-12 student concurrent enrollment opportunities when attending a K-12 school district that has entered into a partnership with the local community college district. This is a popular concept but one that has raised significant questions about allowing higher enrollment priority for K-12 students over some college level students.

**Senate Bill 760 (Alquist)** adds new reporting requirements for California Community Colleges. The bill attempts to clarify reporting requirements adopted in the education trailer bill earlier this year (SB 70, Chapter 7, Statutes of 2011). Specifically, SB 760 requires institutions participating in the Cal Grant program to provide student specific data regarding enrollment, persistence, and graduation for all students, as well as job placement and wage data on all graduates. The bill, however, has clarified reporting requirements in SB 70 in such a way that they go beyond the federal requirements. For example, the bill requires higher education institutions to report data in disaggregated formats that are currently not available and would require considerable new resources to collect. The bill also defines terms for “on-time completion rate”, “placement rate”, and other data elements that create significant implementation challenges within the community college system. The Chancellor’s Office is working with the author’s office to resolve these issues.
Board of Governors Sponsored Bill Package

This year the Board of Governors’ sponsored bill package includes four measures. The common theme of the bills is to utilize the latest technology and innovation to increase efficiency and serve students more effectively. The statuses of the bills are as follows:

- **AB 743 (Block) Common Assessment.** This bill would establish a common assessment tool for all colleges to use in placing students in mathematics, English and English as a Second Language. The bill has bipartisan support and passed the Assembly set for Senate Education Committee on June 22.

- **AB 1056 (Fong) Electronic Transcripts.** This bill would create an incentive to have all colleges utilize electronic transcripts by December 2012. The bill passed the Assembly and has been assigned to the Senate Education Committee.

- **AB 1029 (Lara) Stand Alone Course Approval.** This bill extends the authority provided to community college districts to approve instructional courses that are not a part of established educational programs. These courses are known as “stand-alone” courses because they fall outside the traditional groupings of credit courses that culminate in degrees. This bill passed the Assembly will be heard by the Senate Education Committee on June 15.

The following report highlights and provides a brief analysis of major community college bills introduced this year. The bills are organized by topic. Attached you will also find the latest Community College Chancellor’s Office matrix, which can also be found online on the Government Relations webpage: [http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/GovtRelations/tabid/231/Default.aspx](http://www.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/Divisions/GovtRelations/tabid/231/Default.aspx)

**Academic Affairs**

**AB 160 (Portantino) Concurrent Enrollment in Secondary School and Community College**

**Analysis / Summary:** AB 160 makes several changes to existing law regarding concurrent enrollment. The bill allows a school district to enter into a partnership with a community college district to determine local concurrent enrollment policies for K-12 students, including the ability to establish enrollment priority for concurrent enrollment students and to remove the 5 percent summer enrollment cap.

**Location:** The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Education. The hearing is set for June 22th.

**Position:** Support

**AB 230 (Carter) Joint Educational Programs: Middle College High School Students: Enrollment Priority**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill exempts students attending Middle College High Schools (MCHS), who regularly enroll in community college courses to complete their education program, from the requirement that California Community College governing boards assign low enrollment priority to concurrent enrollment students.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE
1102 Q STREET | SACRAMENTO, CA | 95814 | (916) 449-4349 | [WWW.CCCCO.EDU](http://WWW.CCCCO.EDU)
Comments: If enacted, AB 230 would affect less than 2,000 high school students enrolled in 11 MCHS programs funded by the CCC Chancellor’s Office.

Location: The bill passed the Senate Committee on Education and was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. No set hearing date.

Position: Support

**AB 288 (Fong) Community Colleges: Student Expulsion**

Analysis/Summary: AB 288 would authorize the governing board or designee(s), of a district to deny, permit, or place conditions on the enrollment of an individual who has been expelled from a community college within the preceding 5 years, or who is undergoing expulsion procedures. Further, AB 288 would grant districts authority to request pertinent discipline related information from other collegiate institutions and mandates a response within 5 days. Finally, AB 288 requires a student who has been expelled from a collegiate institution within the preceding 5 years to inform the district at the time of application; failure to do so will be considered by the governing board or designee at the time of the hearing. As an oversight measure, the board or delegate is required to hold a hearing before taking any action on such an individual.

Comments: AB 288 is sponsored by Peralta Community College and is nearly identical to AB 1400 of 2009 which was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger.

Location: Passed the Assembly (60-0) and sent to the Senate for assignment to a policy committee.

Position: Support

**AB 515 (Brownley) Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges**

Analysis/Summary: AB 515 would establish a pilot community college extension program that authorizes the governing board of a community college district, without approval of the Board of Governors, to establish and maintain an extension program offering credit courses. Community college district governing boards are prohibited from expending General Fund moneys to support the pilot program and are permitted to set student fees that cover the full cost of instruction. The bill also specifies that collective bargaining and Title 5 regulations would still apply.

Comments: This bill is sponsored by Santa Monica Community College and the College of the Canyons and is intended to provide community colleges the option to offer extension courses modeled after the UC and CSU system.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (42-19) and was sent to the Senate.

**SB 532 (Hernandez) Advanced Placement Program**

Analysis/Summary: SB 532 encourages the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, the Academic Senate of the California State University, and the Academic Senate of the University of California to continue their efforts to adopt consistent systemwide guidelines for the acceptance and granting of credit for International Baccalaureate Diploma Program courses taken by students while they are in high school.

Location: The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Education. No hearing date has been set.
AB 661 (Block) Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Programs
Analysis / Summary: AB 661 authorizes the Grossmont - Cuyamaca Community College District (in San Diego County) and the San Mateo County Community College District (located between San Francisco and Silicon Valley) to establish one baccalaureate degree pilot program per campus as a pilot program. The baccalaureate degrees offered shall be limited to those subject areas that involve meeting unmet workforce needs in the local community, and shall not duplicate existing programs at nearby public postsecondary educational institutions. Districts that offer baccalaureate degree programs must have the resources and expertise to offer a specific degree. The bill does not appropriate state funds. The pilot project shall sunset after 8 years. The district shall report to the Legislature one year prior to the expiration of the project on the success of the program.

Comments: The intent is that start-up funding would be underwritten by private workforce partners, and that the districts would charge students a fee that covers the costs imposed by the program.

Location: AB 661 was placed on the Assembly Inactive File, and will not move forward this year. It is now a “two year” bill and may be pursued in 2012.

AB 851 (Nestande) Distance Learning
Analysis / Summary: AB 851 adds a new section to the California Distance Learning Policy in the Education Code which makes several provisions regarding distance learning. First, the bill defines distance learning as a course where a majority of the instruction is delivered through technology and where the student and instructor are in different locations for the purposes of data collection and reporting. Second, the bill requires the Board of Governors of the CCC (and CSU and requests UC, to report to the Legislature on workload and performance data on distance learning courses starting on January 1, 2014 and every two years thereafter. Finally, the bill specifies that the LAO convene a task force to identify steps needed to establish a Western Governors University (WGU) in California. [WGU is a national online university offering Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in professions such as teaching, business, IT, and health.] The task force is to consult with UC, CSU, CCC and CPEC.

Comments: According to the author’s office, this bill was prompted by the October 2010 LAO report entitled “The Master Plan at 50: Using Distance Education to Increase College Access and Efficiency.”

Location: Passed the Assembly (76 - 2) and awaiting committee assignment in the Senate.

AB 1028 (Lara) Stand Alone Course Approval
Analysis / Summary: As amended, this bill will extend the authority provided to community college districts to approve instructional courses that are not a part of established educational programs by one year. These courses are known as “stand-alone” courses because they fall outside the traditional groupings of credit courses that culminate in degrees. Examples of these courses include: Literacy Skills I, Fundamentals of Fiber Optics, Piping Systems, Soil Testing and Inspection, etc. The courses are part of a new sequence that are not yet part of the academic program but could be included in the future.

Comments: The authority provided to districts was established in 2006 by AB 1943 (Nava). Prior to AB 1943, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office reviewed and approved courses. Without extending the sunset, the approval for stand-alone courses will revert back to the Chancellor's Office, a costly and less efficient change. AB 1028 was amended in Committee to extend the sunset for one more year, at which time the Chancellor’s Office would be required to submit a report on the number and type of courses approved.
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Location: The bill passed the Assembly (70-0) and was assigned to the Senate Committee on Education, hearing date set for June 15.
Position: Sponsor/Support

**Accountability / Intersegmental / Coordination and Efficiency**

**AB 2 (Portantino) Postsecondary Education: Accountability**
AB 2 would repeal existing higher education accountability requirements and instead establish a new statewide postsecondary accountability framework to bennially assess and report on the state's system of higher education in meeting certain educational and economic goals. The framework would include 6 statewide policy questions to measure postsecondary performance.

Comments: The intent of AB 2 is to provide a basis for state and local decision makers to establish goals for California's higher education and a framework to assess and measure whether the state is achieving its goals for an educated workforce.

Location: Passed the Assembly (61-15) and set for hearing in Senate Education Committee on June 22.
Position: Support

**AB 24 (Block) Feasibility Study: Chula Vista**
Analysis/Summary: AB 24 would require the California Postsecondary Commission (CPEC) to complete a study and make a recommendation concerning the feasibility of establishing and expanding postsecondary education opportunities in Chula Vista, California.

Comments: AB 24 is similar to AB 24 (Block) of 2010 which would have required the Chancellor of the California State University to complete and submit to the trustees a study about the feasibility of a CSU satellite program, and ultimately, an independent CSU campus in Chula Vista. A fiscal analysis of AB 24 of 2010 estimated that the cost of CPEC to perform a study could be up to $600,000.

Location: In the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, and was not heard. Because this bill did not meet the deadline for this year to pass out of the policy committee, this bill is now a two-year bill.

**AB 743 (Block) Common Assessment**
Analysis/Summary: AB 743 establishes a statewide common assessment system to place community college students in English, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language courses. This measure would avoid duplication of assessments at different campuses and would allow students to take their test scores with them to any California Community College. It would also create a pre-test application where students can take practice tests so that they are better prepared for their assessments and can consequently take transfer level courses sooner. CCCC0 staff estimates that this measure could potentially save between $3 and $4 million in assessment costs by reducing duplication among campuses.

Comments: Amendments were taken to reduce the costs of the measure by providing that existing tests can be used, rather than being developed from scratch. Amendments also specified that the provisions are contingent upon receipt of state, federal or philanthropic funding.
Location: Passed out of the Assembly (68-6) and set for Senate Education Committee on June 22.
Position: Sponsor/Support

**SB 721 (Lowenthal) Educational and Economic Goals**
Analysis / Summary: SB 721 would require an undesignated state entity to establish a new accountability framework for the state’s postsecondary education system to achieve educational and economic goals. An assessment shall be provided every two years. At this point no dates are specified in the bill.

Comments: According to the author’s office, the intent of this bill will be to articulate goals for higher education. This bill is similar to AB 2 (Portantino) of this year but does not contain many details at this point.

Location: In the Senate Education Committee, and was not heard. Because this bill did not meet the deadline for this year to pass out of the policy committee, this bill is now a two-year bill.

**SB 885 (Simitian) Public Education Accountability**
Analysis / Summary: SB 885 authorizes the Community College Chancellor’s Office, CSU, UC, CPEC, the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Employment Development Department, and the CA School Information Services to enter into a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to develop a comprehensive data base for students from preschool through higher education (P-20).

Comments: This bill is sponsored by the author, Senator Simitian, based on his interest in developing a comprehensive data base for P-20. The purpose of the bill is to bring the parties together so that the segments of higher education can coordinate their data systems with K-12 and each other. The creation of a JPA through SB 885 is the result of a suggestion by a LAO-convened working group established by SB 1298 (Simitian) of 2008 which sought to create a plan for a linked education data system.

Location: Passed the Senate Floor (38-C) and set for hearing in the Assembly Education Committee on June 22.

**Bonds**

**AB 331 (Brownley) Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2012**
Analysis / Summary: This bill states the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would create the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2012 to provide funds to construct and modernize education facilities, if approved by the voters at the next statewide general election.

Comments: This is a placeholder bill should there be movement to put an education bond on the November 2012 ballot. No bond amounts are specified in this measure.

Location: In the Assembly Education Committee and was not heard. Because this bill did not meet the deadline for this year to pass out of the policy committee, this bill is now a two-year bill.
Position: Support
AB 822 (Block) Public Postsecondary Education Facilities
Analysis / Summary: AB 822 would enact the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2012. It would authorize an unspecified sum of state General Obligation bonds to aid the California Community Colleges, CSU, UC, and Hastings College of the Law to construct and modernize education facilities. It would only become operative if approved by voters at the November 6, 2012 statewide general election.

Comments: This measure is more focused on higher education facilities than AB 331 (Brownley), which is targeted more toward K-12 facilities. According to the author’s office, there is a higher education working group consisting of representatives of CCC, CSU, and UC who are following this issue.

Location: In the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, and was not heard. Because this bill did not meet the deadline for this year to pass out of the policy committee, this bill is now a two-year bill.

SB 911 (De Leon) Local Agencies: Bond Reporting
Analysis / Summary: SB 911 would require a local agency to provide a report with information for each expenditure of bond funds over $5,000. It would also prevent a local agency from spending local bond funds if they have not filed this report or if the local citizens’ oversight committee has not produced its required report.

Comments: This bill is in response to the problems in Los Angeles Community College District that were highlighted by a recent series of stories in the Los Angeles Times. Some of the specific issues were: contractors marking up costs, conflict of interests among district officials and contractors and a lack of oversight by the citizen’s oversight committee. The bill will be substantially amended to remove the citizen’s oversight committee provision and increase the dollar amount to be reported on.

Location: Passed Senate Floor (37-0) and referred to the Assembly Local Government Committee.

Budget / Finance / Facilities

AB 85 (Mendoza) Community College Facilities: Security Locks
Analysis / Summary: AB 85 would require that all plans for construction or alteration (including modernization) of community college facilities contain security locks that conform to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (i.e., locks that lock from the inside).

Comments: This bill is sponsored by CFT to increase campus safety by requiring locks that can be locked from the inside so that in case of a violent intruder, the teacher or students will have the ability to keep the intruder out. AB 85 was drafted to address safety concerns expressed by faculty in both K-12 schools and community colleges and the experiences of the author, a former K-12 teacher. AB 85 is similar to AB 211, a bill signed into law last year that required K-12 to install locks. The estimated cost of AB 211 was $160,000 to $320,000. The cost of AB 85 may be much higher since AB 85 has a broad scope and would apply to construction and modernization projects, whereas AB 211 applied only to new construction. By amending the Field Act statutes, AB 85 triggers reviews of all projects by the Division of the State Architect, which could mean that any project would be required to comply with the new provisions. CFT and the author’s office has reached out to the Chancellor’s Office staff and we are reviewing options to address safety concerns, taking into account the fiscal climate and the enforcement of Title 24 building standards.
Location: The bill was heard in Assembly Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.

**AB 216 (Swanson) Inmate Education Programs**

Analysis / Summary: AB 216 would allow community colleges to receive full funding for credit courses offered in correctional institutions. Specifically, it would waive “open course” provisions for community college courses offered in state correctional facilities and would allow attendance hours generated by credit courses at all correctional facilities to be funded at the full credit rate.

Comments: The bill is intended to increase educational attainment for inmates, thus reducing high recidivism rates.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (77-0) and was assigned to the Senate Committee on Education, hearing date set for June 22.

Position: Support

**AB 285 (Furtant) Community Colleges: Property Tax Backfill**

Analysis / Summary: AB 285 provides community colleges with an automatic funding backfill of property taxes, similar to the one currently in place for K-12 school districts. AB 285 removes funding uncertainty and avoids mid-year cuts to base programs when property tax revenues come in lower than the estimate provided for community colleges in the budget.

Comments: This bill provides greater funding stability and averts the need to make mid-year cuts to academic programs and student support services, all actions that directly affect a student’s ability to persist and complete their education in a timely fashion.

Location: The bill was heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.

Position: Sponsor/Support

**AB 478 (Hernandez) Community Colleges: Funding**

Analysis / Summary: AB 478 would amend existing law that requires the Board of Governors to develop criteria for their annual budget request that is based on specified criteria, including the positive difference between the state unemployment rate and a rate of 5%. The bill would increase the community colleges annual statutory growth rate calculation by removing the 2% cap.

Comments: Currently, the law requires that we receive the growth to accommodate new students based on two factors: 1) The year-to-year percentage change in California’s adult population; and 2) the statewide unemployment rate above 5% and capped at 2%. This bill would amend statute by removing the 2% cap.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (77-0) and was assigned to the Senate Committee on Education, hearing date set for June 22.

Position: Support

**AB 1079 (Bial) Personal Income Taxes: Credit: Higher Education**

Analysis / Summary: Beginning on or after January 1, 2011 AB 1079 would allow a credit of up to $500 per student for college costs paid or incurred by a taxpayer for the taxpayer, spouse, or dependant. The credit would be limited for all taxable years to a total of $2,000 per eligible student. This bill would take effect immediately as a tax levy.
Location: In the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation. Because this bill was not heard, it is now a two year bill.

**SCA 5 (Simimian) Taxation: Educational Entities: Parcel Tax**

Analysis / Summary: SCA 5 authorizes school districts, community college districts, or county offices of education to impose a parcel tax on real property by a 55% vote of the voters in the district or county. It defines “parcel tax” as a special tax imposed upon real property at a rate determined without regard to the property’s value.

Comments: Currently it takes a two-thirds vote to impose parcel tax changes.

Location: Passed the Senate Government and Finance Committee, and referred to Senate Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments. No set hearing date.

Position: Support

**Campus Safety**

**AB 620 (Block) Nondiscrimination and Training, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity**

Analysis / Summary: In its current form, AB 620 requires the BOG and CSU, and requests the UC Regents, to establish policies on harassment, intimidation, and bullying to be included in the rules of student conduct related to gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation. Campuses would be asked to designate an employee at each campus to be a point of contact to address the needs of LGBT students. Campuses would also be requested to provide CPEC with demographic information they collect regarding sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression. CPEC would be encouraged to conduct an assessment of the campuses, develop recommendations, and publish their recommendations on their web site.

Comments: The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office staff is working with the author’s office to amend the bill to address concerns regarding mandates for local community college district governing boards. This bill was introduced in response to a June 2009 CPEC study entitled “Access & Equity for all Students: Meeting the Needs of LGBT Students”, which found that LGBT students have unique challenges that could be addressed through additional campus services and resources.

Location: Passed out of the Assembly (51-24) and set for hearing in the Senate Education Committee on June 22.

**AB 795 (Block) Smoke-free Campuses**

Analysis / Summary: AB 795 expands language to mandate that the California Community Colleges post signs denoting where smoking tobacco is prohibited and where it is permitted. AB 795 also grants the governing boards of the CCC’s the authority to enact enforcement procedures, impose a fine for a first, second, or third offense and those that may occur thereafter as well as requiring that students and staff be informed of smoking related policies. Finally, AB 795 makes it illegal to sell tobacco products on the campuses of a community college.

Comments: As amended, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.
Location: Passed the Assembly (54-23) and was set to be heard on June 15 in the Senate Education Committee.

ACR 17 [Fong] Campus Safety Month
Analysis/Summary: ACR 17 designates March as campus safety month, as well as encourages citizens to visit the web site of the California Postsecondary Education Commission for more information about safety on all public and private college campuses.

Location: Chaptered by Secretary of State Resolution, Chapter 11, Statutes of 2011.

CTE / Green Jobs / Energy / Workforce Preparation

AB 554 [Atkins] Employment: Workforce Services
Analysis/Summary: This bill directs the California Workforce Investment Board and its local boards to develop a policy that establishes collaboration with community colleges to develop pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs in the geographic area.

Comments: According to the author’s office, this bill is sponsored by State Building and Trades.

Location: The bill passed the Senate Labor Committee and referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 848 [Campos] Apprenticeships
Analysis/Summary: AB 848 would require the Chancellor’s Office to collect data on credits attained by apprentices. This requirement would only apply to building and construction trades programs that receive Reimbursement for Supplies and Instruction funds.

Comments: The bill is sponsored by multiple labor organizations. The goal is to provide potential apprentices with information and encourage more apprenticeship programs to offer credit. Chancellor’s Office staff has indicated that a survey of the apprenticeship programs already exists and could be modified to meet requirements of the bill.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (54-25) and was assigned to the Senate Committee on Education, hearing date set for June 22.

AB 1115 [Lara] Local Workforce Investment Boards
Analysis/Summary: AB 1115 establishes statewide standards for local workforce investment boards. One new standard would allow the local workforce investment board to create a list of approved training providers. Community college CTE programs would automatically be placed on this list.

Location: Passed the Assembly Floor and referred to the Senate Labor Committee.

Position: Support

AB 1137 [V. Manuel Perez] Economic Development
Analysis/Summary: This measure makes changes to Government Code with respect to international trade to provide authority to the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTH) for specified
programs. AB 1137 authorizes the establishment of the California Export Promotion and Gap Financing Program (Export Assistance Program), within BT&H, and states that the BT&H may apply for federal program funding for the state trade and export program.

Comments: Through the Economic and Workforce Development Program, the Community Colleges operate Centers for International Trade and Development (CITD). These Centers provide assistance to small and medium sized businesses and have been designated by the Governor to apply for the State Trade and Export Program (STEP) grant funding through the US Small Business Program. Provisions of AB 1137 may prevent the CITDs from competing for and using the STEP grant. The Chancellor’s Office will seek amendments to remove provisions that prohibit the colleges from applying for the STEP grant.

Location: AB 1137 passed the Assembly and is assigned to the Senate Business, Professions, and Economic Development Committee. No hearing date has been set.

AB 1310 (Furutani) State Strategic Plan: Career Technical Education and Workforce Development Analysis / Summary: This bill would require the Chancellor’s Office, California Workforce Investment Board, CSU, UC, CDE and other agencies to coordinate on the development of a strategic plan for connecting education and workforce development.

Comments: Similar to AB 35 from last year, this bill shifts the responsibility for developing the strategic plan from the California Workforce Investment Board to the Chancellor’s Office without shifting CWIB federal funds currently used to support this effort.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (63-13) and was sent to the Senate.

SB 698 (Lieu) Workforce Development: High Performance Boards Analysis / Summary: This bill would require the Governor to establish, through the CA Workforce Investment Board, a process by which to identify high performing local boards. Only designated high performing boards would be eligible to receive state discretionary funds and grants. High performing local boards shall, among other things, demonstrate that the local planning process take into account the entire workforce training pipeline for the local economy, including the local community college system.

Comments: This bill is sponsored by the State Building and Trades Council and the CA Labor Federation.

Location: The bill passed off the Senate Floor (39-0) and is awaiting committee assignment from the Senate Rules Committee.

Dream Act / Immigration Issues/Registration Requirements

AB 130 (Cedillo) Student Financial Aid: Eligibility: California Dream Act of 2011 Analysis/Summary: This bill would provide persons who are exempt from paying nonresident tuition eligibility for student financial aid.

Comments: The bill was amended to delete the language that specified the process and procedures for applying for aid; the procedures were shifted to AB 131 (Cedillo). The bill was also amended to remove the provision from AB 130 that allowed persons attending and graduating from California technical
schools and adult schools, as well as high schools, to be included in the exemption for nonresident tuition; this provision was also shifted to AB 131 (Cedillo). These amendments were taken to reduce the fiscal impact of the bill.

Location: The bill passed the Senate Education Committee and was referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations, no set hearing.

Position: Support

**AB 131 (Cedillo) Student Financial Aid**

Analysis/Summary: As amended, this bill changes existing law to require the Trustees of California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and to request the Regents of the University of California, to establish procedures and forms that enable persons who are exempt from paying nonresident tuition to apply for, and participate in, all student financial aid programs administered by these segments. This bill also would require the Student Aid Commission to establish procedures and forms that enable persons who are exempt from paying nonresident tuition to apply for all student financial aid programs administered by the State of California to the full extent permitted by federal law, except for Competitive Cal Grant A and B Awards unless funding remains available after all eligible California students who are not exempt receive Competitive Cal Grant A and B Awards. The bill would also require community college districts to waive the fees of persons who are exempt from nonresident tuition. Lastly, the bill would allow persons attending and graduating from California technical schools and adult schools, as well as high schools, to be included in the exemption for nonresident tuition.

Comments: This bill is similar to last year’s AB 1413 (Fuentes-Cojo), which was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger. This bill was amended to include the establishment of procedures for applying for aid and to allow persons attending and graduating from California technical schools and adult schools, as well as high schools, to be included in the exemption for nonresident tuition; wording was directly shifted from AB 130 (Cedillo).

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (50-27) and was sent to the Senate.

Position: Support

**AB 844 (Lara) Student Government: Students Qualifying for Exemption from Nonresident Tuition**

Analysis/Summary: This bill would add a provision to the Donahue Higher Education Act that would provide that a student who is exempt from paying nonresident tuition is eligible to serve in any capacity in student government at the California State University or the California Community Colleges and to receive any compensation, as defined, that is connected with that service to the full extent consistent with federal law.

Comments: Late last year the CSU Fresno Student Body President was identified as serving in student government as an AB 540 student. He had waived his compensation for the roughly $800/month Presidents receive.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (49-25) and was assigned to the Senate Committee on Education, hearing date set for June 15.
Faculty

AB 383 [Portantino] Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges: Faculty
Analysis / Summary: This bill would provide a one-time stipend, an undetermined amount, to a California Community College (CCC) district that enters into a collective bargaining agreement that prohibits a full-time instructor from teaching overload or extra assignments in excess of 50% of a full-time workload in any semester that commences on or after January 1, 2012.

Comments: The purpose of this bill is to provide an incentive for community college districts to limit full-time faculty overload assignments exceeding 50% of a full-time workload.

Location: In the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, held in committee. Because this bill was not heard, it is now a two year bill.

AB 852 [Fong] Community Colleges: Faculty
Analysis / Summary: This bill would provide that temporary community college faculty members have a right of first refusal for teaching assignments. This provision, however, would be superseded by any greater rights that could be provided in a collective bargaining agreement.

Comments: AB 852 is sponsored by FACCC. This bill is similar to AB 1807 [Fong] from last year, which was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Location: The bill passed off the Assembly Floor (51-27) and is awaiting committee assignment from the Assembly Rules Committee.

AB 965 [Dickinson] Community Colleges: Full-time Faculty Hiring
Analysis / Summary: AB 965 requires community colleges that have less than 75% of their hours of credit instruction taught by full-time faculty to use funds allocated for growth to move toward meeting the 75% goal based on a specified formula.

Comments: In current statute, community college districts that do not meet the 75% goal/standard are required to use a percentage of their program improvement funds towards meeting the 75% goal/standard. However, the state no longer provides “program-improvement” funds. AB 965 “notwithstanding” Education Code requiring the use of program improvement funds towards meeting the 75% goal/standard, and adds a section requiring the use of growth funds for this purpose.

Location: In the Assembly Committee on Higher Education and because it was not heard before the deadline is now a two year bill.

SB 114 [Yee] Community College Part-time Faculty Salary
Analysis / Summary: As written, SB 114 would require community college districts to determine the compensation of part-time faculty using a salary schedule that places part-time faculty on comparable salary steps as full-time faculty with similar education and experience. The bill would require part-time faculty to be paid in a manner similar to the placement of full-time faculty on the schedule.

Comments: SB 114 is sponsored by the California Federation of Teachers (CFT). CFT representatives state that the bill language will be revised and the intent is to provide guidance to local colleges to help ensure that part-time faculty salaries are equitable to full-time faculty salaries for comparable instruction.
Location: The bill was heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.

**SB 189 (Anderson) Community Colleges Faculty**

Analysis/Summary: SB 189 amends Education Code affecting part-time faculty to state that dual enrollment shall not be used for calculating eligibility for contract or regular status for persons employed to teach adult or community college classes as part-time faculty.

Comments: This bill was introduced to address local high school and Mt. San Jacinto Community College concerns that the temporary contract status (67% law) of faculty who teach community college coursework at the high school is altered by their assignment to these classes.

Location: In the Senate Education Committee and because it was not heard, it is now a two year bill.

---

**Local Administration**

**SB 46 (Correa) Compensation Disclosure**

Analysis/Summary: SB 46 requires local government officers and employees who file economic interest statements to annually file a compensation disclosure form which includes the following items: annual salary or stipend; local agency payments to the filer’s deferred compensation or defined benefit plans; automobile and equipment allowances; supplemental incentive and bonus payments; and any local agency payments to the filer that are in excess of standard benefits for other employees. SB 46 would include, among others, elected or appointed officers of community college districts, community college presidents, community college vice presidents, and community college deputy vice presidents.

Comments: This bill was prompted by the scandal involving public employees from the City of Bell.

Location: The bill was amended to become an emergency measure requiring a 2/3 vote. The bill is on the Senate floor.

---

**Pensions**

**SB 27 (Simitian) Public Retirement: Final Compensation: Computation: Retirees**

Analysis/Summary: This bill would prohibit members of Public Employees’ Retirement System (PERS) or State Teachers’ Retirement System (STRS) who retire after January 1, 2013 from working (including part-time or under contract) for a PERS/STRS employer for 6 months after retirement. This bill specifies that if a STRS or STRS retiree earns compensation in violation of this requirement, his or her retirement allowance will be reduced by the amount of compensation earned in the prohibited period. This bill becomes operative for all active and future members of the retirement systems beginning July 1, 2012.

Comments: This bill institutes uniform laws for PERS and STRS retirement systems that will help to curtail an individual from taking extraordinary steps to enhance their retirement benefits also known as spiking. This provision would eliminate ‘reversing door’ practices in which some public employees retire on a Friday and return to the same job on Monday as a retired worker.

Location: The bill passed off the Senate floor (39-0) and is awaiting committee assignment from the Assembly Rules Committee.
Other

**AB 684 (Block) Community College Districts: Trustee Elections**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill would allow community college districts that wish to switch from at-large trustee elections to trustee area elections to do so via a waiver process. The waiver would be approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

**Comments:** This bill is sponsored by the League of California Community Colleges. The intent is to assist districts to comply with the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) in a cost effective manner. The CVRA makes it difficult for districts to maintain at large elections. A district can be challenged under the CVRA and spend millions defending their election system and if they lose they will spend more to trustee area elections. The waiver process will allow districts to avoid costly litigation and consulting fees. The State Board of Education already approves similar waivers for K-12 districts.

**Location:** The bill passed off the Assembly Floor (72-3) and will be heard in the Senate Education Committee on June 22nd.

**SB 8 (Yee) Public Records State Agency: Auxiliary Organizations**

**Analysis / Summary:** SB 8 would apply provisions of the California Public Records Act (CPRA) to auxiliary organizations of the University of California and the California State University, as well local CCD auxiliaries, and the official auxiliary to the Chancellor’s Office, the Foundation for California Community Colleges.

**Comments:** This bill is similar to SB 330 (Yee) of 2010 and SB 218 (Yee) of 2009, both of which were vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger. UC and CSU were strongly opposed to prior versions of the bill, but have removed their opposition after negotiating amendments with the author and sponsor to protect donor anonymity. Proposed amendments for the Assembly Higher Education Committee will include the same protections for donors provided to the UC and CSU auxiliaries for local community college district auxiliaries, and the Foundation for California Community Colleges. According to the sponsor, and several CCDs, the CPRA applies to auxiliary bodies established by local community college districts, and the local foundations have been operating under the CPRA.

**Location:** SB 8 passed the Senate (38-1) with Senator Blakeslee the lone no vote in the Senate Education and Judiciary Committees, and on the floor. SB 8 will be heard in the Assembly Higher Education Committee on June 21, 2011.

**SB 238 (De León) Athlete Agents**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill would protect student athletes, colleges, and universities from unscrupulous athlete agents by implementing a new penalty for violating the Miller-Ayala Athletic Agents Act. This bill would require athlete agents who are convicted of violating the Miller-Ayala Athletic Agents Act to disgorge all gross revenues that they are owed or received in connection with the violation and will require the courts to suspend or revoke the business privileges of convicted athlete agents.
Location: This bill was assigned to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, hearing date set for June 14. 
Position: Support

SB 405 (Solario) Community Colleges: Joint Use Facilities
Analysis / Summary: This bill would require the Board of Governors to establish the California Community College Joint Use Program, to support the creation of joint use facilities on community college campuses. The program will be for the creation of new and/or renovated facilities that are governed by a joint use agreement between a community college district and a third-party public agency. The establishment of the program is subject to the availability of funding.

Location: The bill was heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.

State Operations

SB 629 (Lowenthal) Board of Governors: Vice Chancellor Appointments
Analysis / Summary: This bill expands the definition for the state classification of “career executive assignment” (CEA). SB 629 authorizes the Chancellor to appoint a vice chancellor or assistant vice chancellor as a CEA who has a minimum of five years of work experience at a local community college, a higher education policy position, or in a technical or occupation capacity for which there is a shortage of qualified workers. Current statute limits CEA positions to civil servants, former civil servants, current or former gubernatorial appointees and legislative staff.

Location: Held on the Senate Floor.
Position: Sponsor/Support

Student Fees and Affordability

AB 91 (Portantino) Community Colleges: Student Financial Aid
Summary / Analysis: This bill requires the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to establish a voluntary pilot program to increase student participation in state and federal financial aid programs. It also requires the Chancellor to provide specified information to the Legislative Analyst’s Office, which the office would be required to use to report to the Legislature on the results of the program, and make recommendations for statewide expansion of the pilot program.
Comments: It is estimated that AB 91 would create minor increased costs for the Chancellor’s Office for administering the pilot project. Local costs for implementation at the campus level are undetermined.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (79-0) and was sent to the Senate.

SB 451 (Price) Student Financial Aid: Cal Grant C Awards
Analysis / Summary: SB 451 requires the California Student Aid Commission (Commission) to develop areas of occupational and technical training for which students may use Cal Grant C awards. The Commission would then give priority in granting Cal Grant C awards to students pursuing training in fields...
that meet two of the three following criteria: high employment need, high salary or wage projections, or high employment growth. It also calls for a review and update of these designated occupational areas at least every five years beginning in 2012. The Legislative Analyst's Office would be required to submit a report to the Governor and Legislature on the outcomes of the Cal Grant C program every other year beginning April 1, 2015.

Comments: The Appropriations Committee deemed this bill of minor or no fiscal impact to the State.

Location: Referred to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education. No set hearing date.

**SB 760 [Alquist] Postsecondary Education: The Cal Grant Program**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill clarifies and defines the annual reporting requirements, required under SB 70 (Chapter 7, 2011) for all institutions that voluntarily choose to participate in the Cal Grant program.

Comments: Chapter 7, Statutes of 2011 (SB 70, the Education Budget Trailer Bill) began the process of requiring the reporting of enrollment, persistence, graduation, and job placement data of institutions participating in the Cal Grant program. The bill is intended clarify new data reporting requirements from SB 70 related to Cal Grant participating institutions by aligning data elements as much as possible with those already required for federal Title V financial aid eligibility. The Chancellor's Office staff is working with the author on amendments.

Location: The bill passed the Senate (36-9) and was sent to the Assembly.

---

**Student Success and Transfer**

**AB 194 [Beall] Public Postsecondary Education: Priority Enrollment: Foster Youth**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill would require the California State University and California Community College districts and requests the University of California, to grant priority registration for enrollment to foster youth or former foster youth. The bill defines foster youth as any person currently in foster youth care and former or emancipated foster youth up to age 24. This bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

Location: The bill passed the Senate Committee on Education and was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. No set hearing date.

Position: Support

**AB 1056 [Fong] Electronic Transcripts**

**Analysis / Summary:** This bill would create an incentive to have all colleges utilize electronic transcripts by December 2012. AB 1056 expedites the process for community colleges to convert from paper-based transcripts to an electronic based system by December 31, 2012 by leveraging one-time external funding for this purpose. Implementation of this bill is contingent upon receipt of federal funds or outside philanthropic grants.

Comments: Mailing paper-based transcripts from one institution of higher education to another is timely and not cost-effective. Currently, paper-based transcripts can take weeks to be delivered to a college or university, thereby delaying the student’s enrollment in classes. Converting from a paper-based transcript
to an e-Transcript system can save the college $4 to $10 per transcript by reducing paper consumption, operating costs, and postage. E-transcripts also allow the student to view their transcripts online. Recent amendments will sunset the bill in 2015 if sufficient funding cannot be acquired and assigns the Chancellor’s Office as the designee for the dispersing of funds.

Location: The bill passed the Assembly (77-1) and was sent to the Senate.
Position: Sponsor/Support

SB 292 (Padilla) Community Colleges Transfers
Analysis / Summary: Amends the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act by requiring that students admitted to the California State University receive priority enrollment over all other community college transfer students, excluding community college students who have entered into a transfer agreement between a community college and the California State University prior to the fall term of the 2012-13 academic year.

Location: The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education. No set hearing date.
Position: Support

Veterans Issues

AB 372 (Hernandez) Public Postsecondary Education
Analysis / Summary: AB 372 Requires California Community Colleges (CCC) faculty to provide military service personal and veterans an assessment f college-level learning gained in non-academic settings as part of the matriculation process according to the standards of the American Council on Education (ACE). Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, or other equivalent standard for awarding academic credits, and requires CCC districts to implement these provisions only to the extent that reimbursement for the prior learning experience assessment is provided by the federal Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to provisions of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 or any other federal act establishing veterans education benefits.

Comments: Fifty California Community Colleges are members of a consortium that uses the ACE guidelines. Prior versions of the bill would have created a state mandate for the sixty-two colleges that are not part of the consortium. Recent amendments to remove/reduce the costs associated with the bill provide that the assessment would be paid through the veteran’s benefits. Currently, community colleges provide a process for credit by exam and charge the student. This process is for all students and the student veteran may use their GI Bill benefits to pay for the credit by exam. Existing college processes provide the authority for colleges to use the ACE guidelines, and credit by exam. AB 372 highlights concerns expressed by student veterans who are seeking college credit for instruction in a military setting. As previously noted, to support our veteran students, the Academic Senate for the Community Colleges recently approved a resolution encouraging the use of the ACE guidelines.

Location: This bill passed off the Assembly Floor (76-0) and is awaiting committee assignment from the Senate Rules Committee
Position: Support, if amended
AB 635 (Knight) Veterans’ Benefits: Public Postsecondary Education: Mandatory Educational Fees
Analysis / Summary: For the purposes of veterans’ benefits, AB 635 amends the Military and Veterans Code to authorize the University of California, California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to designate mandatory educational fees as tuition.

Comments: This bill is sponsored by the author in response to concerns by student veterans who stated that they are prevented from using their post 9/11 GI bill education benefits to pay for costs labeled as “fees.” by authorizing public universities to define fees (e.g., lab fees) as part of the tuition, veterans will be able to fully use their education benefits. The author recognizes that the UC and CSU systems have addressed the definition of fees and tuition for GI Bill education benefits through administrative action. However, the author wants to ensure the definition is placed in statute.

Location: Passed the Assembly Veterans Committee and sent to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education. Because this bill was not heard, it is now a two year bill.

AB 636 (Knight) Military Service: Veterans Benefits
Analysis/ Summary: Current Military and Veterans Code requires colleges to provide military students the option of a refund of tuition and fees paid for the subsequent academic term due to a military leave of absence, provided the student withdraws before the withdrawal date established by the college. AB 636 would eliminate the requirement that the student withdraw by a specified date. AB 636 also requires that any credit toward a subsequent academic term must be equal to 100% of the cost of the subsequent tuition and fees paid to the institution for the current academic term.

Comments: National Guard, active duty and veteran students may be called to service and deployed by the Governor or the President of the United States at a moment’s notice. This deployment may interrupt their education and cost the student money and disrupt their education. This bill assists the student by taking into consideration deployments and expanding their options upon their return to the college.

Location: This bill passed off the Assembly Floor (78-0) and will be heard in the Senate Education Committee and the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee.
Position: Support

AB 649 (Harkey) Postsecondary Education: Veteran’s Enrollment
Analysis/ Summary: AB 649 would modify the current priority registration requirement for veterans (who are also California residents) by granting veterans an additional three years of priority registration entitlement after leaving active duty. This would bring the total time period within which a veteran student may receive increased priority registration for their service from two years to five years.

Comments: AB 649 amends current statute granting veteran’s priority enrollment. This bill was amended to limit priority for class registration to veterans who are California residents.

Location: AB 649 was held in the Senate Education Committee and the author has agreed to support SB 813.
Position: Support

AB 853 (Blumenfield) Veterans: Tuition and Fees
Analysis/ Summary: AB 853 would amend state law bringing California into compliance with Federal law which requires that a member of the armed forces or their dependants are entitled to resident
classification for the purposes of calculating tuition and fees for the duration of their enrollment in a public institution of higher education.

**Location:** Will be heard in the Senate Education Committee.  
**Position:** Support

**SB 251 (Correa) Vehicles Drivers License: Selective Service**  
**Analysis / Summary:** SB 251 requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to include a notice to males between 18 and 26 years old that they are registering for Selective Service by applying for or renewing their drivers license. The DMV then forwards information to the US Selective Service System to register the applicant.

**Comments:** The author and sponsor (US Selective Service System) have received thousands of letters, mainly from students who were unaware of their obligation to register for Selective Service until they were denied financial aid. The author’s office estimates that California loses over $100 million in lost student financial aid, job training and employment based on letters sent to the US Selective Service System.

**Location:** The bill was heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee and referred to the Suspense File.  
**Position:** Support

**SB 813 (Veterans Affairs Committee) Priority Enrollment for Veterans**  
**Analysis / Summary:** SB 813 is similar to AB 649. This bill amends statute to grant veterans an additional two years of priority registration after leaving active duty. Both bills increase the total time period for a veteran student to receive priority registration from two years to four years.

**Location:** Passed the Senate Floor (39-C) and referred to Senate Education Committee and Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee.  
**Position:** Support
### California Community College Chancellor's Office Legislative Tracking Matrix

**2011 Legislative Session: 6/27/2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 115</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Higher education: Accountability (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 116</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Community colleges: student financial aid (FAFSA, Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 117</td>
<td>Cedillo</td>
<td>Financial Aid for AB 540 Students; Institutional Aid and BOG fee waiver (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 118</td>
<td>Cedillo</td>
<td>Financial Aid for AB 540 Students; Cal Grants (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 119</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Concurrent Enrollment (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 120</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Priority registration: foster youth (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 121</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Inmate Education (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 122</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Middle college high school (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 123</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Property Tax Revenues (Sponsor)</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 124</td>
<td>Feng</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Student expunction (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 125</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Academic credit for military training (Support if amended)</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 126</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Funding (Support)</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 127</td>
<td>Brownley</td>
<td>Community colleges: extension courses (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 128</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Baratinahad Degree: San Diego CCC (Watch)</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 129</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Student government; non-resident students (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 130</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>CSU &amp; CCC: Student government; non-resident students (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 131</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Stand Alone Course Approval (Sponsor)</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 132</td>
<td>Feng</td>
<td>Electronic Transcripts (Sponsor)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 133</td>
<td>Roder</td>
<td>CSU &amp; UC: summer education funding (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 134</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td>Education: Gateway Demonstration Project (Watch)</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 3</td>
<td>Veesky</td>
<td>Auxiliary Organization; Public records (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Government</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 92</td>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>Community College Transfer Students (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Higher Ed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 385</td>
<td>Calderon</td>
<td>Regulation: Agency Review (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 93</td>
<td>Raburn</td>
<td>Local tax: counties; school districts general authorization (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 721</td>
<td>Lowenthal</td>
<td>Higher education: Accountability (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 845</td>
<td>Sondheim</td>
<td>Education Accountability: Delivery of Services (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 234</td>
<td>Saucedo</td>
<td>Local Taxation: School Districts; community colleges (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BILLS TRACKED BY THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE - Tier 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 21</td>
<td>Nezvodez</td>
<td>State budget debt and deficit report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Budget</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 26</td>
<td>Roddy</td>
<td>OPEC: Chavez v. report (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Higher Ed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 25</td>
<td>Donnelly</td>
<td>Local immigration (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Judiciary - Failed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 63</td>
<td>Donnelly</td>
<td>County college residency fees; military AB 540 repeal (Watch)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Higher Ed - Failed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 65</td>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>Community college facilities; security locks (Support if amended)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 311</td>
<td>Borelli</td>
<td>Kindergarten-University Bond Act of 2012 (Support)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>First House</td>
<td>Second House</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 344</td>
<td>Lowenthal</td>
<td>Community college board members absence from the state</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Asm. Ed. &amp; Hld.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 363</td>
<td>Portantino</td>
<td>Faculty workload (2 year all)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Ed. &amp; Hld.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 465</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Joint Use Facilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approp Suspense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 461</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Classified Employees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Asm. Approp Suspense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 490</td>
<td>Cedro</td>
<td>California Community Colleges (Spot)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 531</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>Public school employment, auxiliary org.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 544</td>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>Employment Workforce Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Asm. Ops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 560</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>California Civil Rights Education Advisory Committee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 620</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Postsecondary Education Nondiscrimination Policies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 625</td>
<td>Blumenfeld</td>
<td>Distance Learning, Division</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 635</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Veterans' Benefits Postsecondary Education Fees (Support)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 636</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Military service benefits (Support)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 666</td>
<td>Hersey</td>
<td>Postsecondary Education Veteran's Enrollment (Support)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Sen Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 670</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Public Postsecondary Education, Admissions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 694</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Community Colleges, Board of Trustees elections (Support)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 795</td>
<td>Moniz</td>
<td>Public Officers, Financial Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Ed. &amp; Fin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 807</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Postsecondary Education, Smoke Free Campus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 831</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Kindergarten University Bond Act of 2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 966</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>Consultant Enrollment, Economic and Workforce Development Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 948</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>Aspirational data collection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 991</td>
<td>Nesterio</td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 992</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Temporary Faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 943</td>
<td>Fustani</td>
<td>Public Contracts: Best Value</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 965</td>
<td>Dickerson</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Full time faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1046</td>
<td>Nathy</td>
<td>Local Govt. Bonds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0 x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Out &amp; Fin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1079</td>
<td>Soli</td>
<td>Personal income taxes: Higher Education Credits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Rev &amp; Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1093</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Student Aid Veterans Benefits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1115</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Workforce Development, training sessions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1162</td>
<td>Asm. Vet Comm</td>
<td>Employment Training Pilot Program veterans</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1242</td>
<td>Achtian</td>
<td>Vehicles special interest license plates: NASCAR Foundation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1250</td>
<td>Asele</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1309</td>
<td>Fustani</td>
<td>Charter Tech Ed State Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1330</td>
<td>Fustani</td>
<td>Higher Education Endowment: Oil &amp; Gas Severance Tax</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Rev &amp; Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1330</td>
<td>Fustani</td>
<td>High School Graduation: CTE requirement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1341</td>
<td>Asm. Admin &amp; Fin</td>
<td>Government Reports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Admin &amp; Fin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# California Community College Chancellor's Office Legislative Tracking Matrix

**2011 Legislative Session: 6/27/2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACR 17</td>
<td>Feng</td>
<td>Campus Safety Work</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 24</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies Programs</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 27</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Public Retirement Final Compensation Computations</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 114</td>
<td>Yee</td>
<td>Community Colleges, Academic Salaries Schedules</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Sen. Appropri. Suspense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 115</td>
<td>Yee</td>
<td>Energy Service Contracts Building</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Sen. Appropri. Suspense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 117</td>
<td>Huff</td>
<td>CCC Board of Governors (Sppt)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 189</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Community Colleges Faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 298</td>
<td>Del Zamudio</td>
<td>Athletic Agents</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Judiciary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 433</td>
<td>Wiland</td>
<td>Local Bond Audits</td>
<td>x o x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 451</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Student Financial Aid Cal Grant C Awards (Watch)</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 455</td>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education, CPEC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Business &amp; Prof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 502</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Advanced Placement Program</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 611</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Curriculum Integration</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 612</td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>Public Postsecondary Education: Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 650</td>
<td>Lowenthal</td>
<td>College Promise Partnership Act</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 688</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Workforce Development: Local Wills Watch</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 790</td>
<td>Agresti</td>
<td>Postsecondary Education: The Cal Grant Program</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 772</td>
<td>Agresti</td>
<td>Education Personnel: Compensation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 794</td>
<td>Haroush</td>
<td>Community Colleges: Parking Fees</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Assembly Higher Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 796</td>
<td>Freid</td>
<td>C C D Design Asset contracts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 813</td>
<td>J. Polito</td>
<td>Local Agency Bond Report</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Veterans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 911</td>
<td>De Leon</td>
<td>Local Agency Bond Report</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Local Govt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 940</td>
<td>Sen. Ed. Comm</td>
<td>Public Postsecondary Education: Student Transfer</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 942</td>
<td>Sen. Ed. Comm</td>
<td>Education Omnibus</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 5</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Taxation: Educational Enrichment, Parochial Tax</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Sen. Elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S B 70</td>
<td>De Leon</td>
<td>Scholarship: Apprentices (Support)</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BILLS TRACKED BY THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE - TIER 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1</td>
<td>F. Perez</td>
<td>CalWORKS: child care funding</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>Assembly tease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 7</td>
<td>Portantino</td>
<td>State employees: salary freeze over $150,000</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>Asm. Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 15</td>
<td>V. Perez</td>
<td>Workforce Development: Renewable Energy Workforce (Sppt)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 23</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Local agency meeting</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 27</td>
<td>Serrano</td>
<td>State budget agency hearing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Assembly Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 75</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Health and Human Services: grant opportunities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Asm. Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 89</td>
<td>Villanueva</td>
<td>Retirement: public employees</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>Senate P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>First House</td>
<td>Second House</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  101</td>
<td>Asm. Budget</td>
<td>Community Redevelopment</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  107</td>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>Regulations: effective date</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  146</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Local government, efficiency</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  149</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Civil Service: Personal Services Contracts</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate PUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  150</td>
<td>Perea</td>
<td>State agencies: small business procurement contracts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  152</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Local govt, financial reporting</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Local Govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  172</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>State agency contracts: Internet Web-Site</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  167</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Local Government audits</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  158</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  212</td>
<td>Badi</td>
<td>Foster youth: 'At-GAP' benefits</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Human Services</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  213</td>
<td>Saha</td>
<td>State agencies: regulation notices to local government</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  235</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>State/Controller: local government audits</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  236</td>
<td>Fazlani</td>
<td>State Agencies: Use of a Foreign Language</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  341</td>
<td>Norby</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage: Control, Public Nuisances</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  344</td>
<td>Fazlani</td>
<td>Public Works: local hiring ordinances</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate PUR</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  350</td>
<td>Jaffe</td>
<td>Disability Access Regulations</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  495</td>
<td>Krieger</td>
<td>State Regulations: effective date</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  448</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>Public works: prevailing wages for energy projects</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Labor</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  486</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>Local public employment organizations</td>
<td>x x x x x o x</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  497</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>Public Works: Contracts; Relief Funds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  512</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Local Govt: Renewable energy self-regeneration</td>
<td>x x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate PUR</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  535</td>
<td>Marlett</td>
<td>Regulations: 5-year review</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  541</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>Public Contracts: Prevailing Wage Requirements Penalties</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Labor</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  562</td>
<td>Fren</td>
<td>Local agencies: open meetings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Approps. Susp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  617</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement Death Benefits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  645</td>
<td>Akers</td>
<td>Local Public Employee Organizations: Impasse Procedures</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate PUR</td>
<td>Asm. PERIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  650</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>Ethnic Minority Community College District Elections</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  727</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>Civil Service: Employee Hearings</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate PUR</td>
<td>Asm. PERIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  756</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Hiring preference: foster youth/family agencies</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  778</td>
<td>Hagman</td>
<td>Public Employees Pension: Prohibit Elected Official Retirement Credit</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. APPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB  790</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>Personal Service Contracts</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>Senate Gov. Org.</td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>First House</td>
<td>Second House</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 736</td>
<td>Welschki</td>
<td>State teachers’ retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 739</td>
<td>Haro</td>
<td>Public Employment Benefits: Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 793</td>
<td>Caderon</td>
<td>Public Contracts: Fixed Price Contracts: Tax Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 792</td>
<td>Browley</td>
<td>Public Employee Benefits: Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen. PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 790</td>
<td>Foulkes</td>
<td>Multiple-Pathway Pilot Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 894</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Local Government Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Appro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 890</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Local Reform Act of 1974: political contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Educs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 871</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Public Employment: Employee Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 879</td>
<td>Rucker</td>
<td>Public Employee Media and Hospitals Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 892</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Consideration of Veteran Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Vf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 870</td>
<td>Portantino</td>
<td>Public Employee Bill of Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Apppns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 861</td>
<td>Massop</td>
<td>Public Employee: Pension: Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. PERUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 870</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td>Fire Increases: UC &amp; CSU only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Appro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 567</td>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Public Works: prevailing wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 879</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>State boards: former legislatures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 879</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Personal Income Taxes: Credit: Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Rev. &amp; Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 876</td>
<td>Browley</td>
<td>Private Colleges: facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 874</td>
<td>Gallo</td>
<td>Public Retirement Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 803</td>
<td>Meridith</td>
<td>Public Employee Org, paid/reve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 813</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>State Regulations: public participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Buss &amp; Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 823</td>
<td>V. Perez</td>
<td>State Economic: Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. John Esco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 828</td>
<td>Fundani</td>
<td>Personal income: taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Rev. &amp; Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 822</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Elections: LA C.C.U.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 837</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Local Gov: Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Local Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 825</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Workforce Development: Local Wills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 834</td>
<td>Bock</td>
<td>Linked Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 820</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 842</td>
<td>Dickerson</td>
<td>Roofing projects: contract/bds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Bus &amp; Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 845</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Local Gov: appointment of council/board members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Local Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 831</td>
<td>Forney</td>
<td>Public Works: bomb notices (spot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Local Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 824</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Public works: paymenst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Business &amp; Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 836</td>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>Private Colleges: financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 151</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Public Contracts: awards (spot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asm. Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 150</td>
<td>Sawicki</td>
<td>State employment: posting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 12</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>CalWORKS child care funding</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 31</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td>Local Government Lobbyist Registration</td>
<td>Senate Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 46</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td>Local Government Salary Disclosure</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 56</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Apprenticeship oversight</td>
<td>Senate Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 67</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>State agencies: small business procurement contracts</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 77</td>
<td>Sen. Budget</td>
<td>Community Redevelopment</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 103</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>State Agencies: Teleconferences</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 172</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>State Medicine: Clearing Instructions</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 175</td>
<td>Strickland</td>
<td>Public Employees: Pension: Forfeitures</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 177</td>
<td>Kefoie</td>
<td>State agency contracts: Prohibitions: Discrimination</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 177</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>State agencies: Solar Photovoltaic Systems Contracts</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 191</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Public Postsecondary Education, Student Fee Policy (UC and CSU)</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 195</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Public Postsecondary Education, Admissions criteria (UC and CSU)</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 236</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>California Public Records Act (spol)</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 241</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td>DMV: Selective Service</td>
<td>Senate Trans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 245</td>
<td>Virgus</td>
<td>State Agency Contracting</td>
<td>Assembly Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SB 259 | Hancock | Student employees: UC and CSU | Senate Appropriations, Senate:
| SB 295 | Wright | Redevelopment: Local Education Agencies | Senate Appropriations, Senate:
| SB 295 | Wright | Redevelopment: Local Education Agencies | Senate Appropriations, Senate:
| SB 322 | Negrete-McLeod | Public Employee Retirement: multiple employers | Senate Education |
| SB 330 | Weick | Acoustic: Savings Conn.: Public Schoolhouses | Senate Local Govt. |
| SB 345 | Negrete-McLeod | CALSTERS | Senate Rules |
| SB 350 | Negrete-McLeod | Public Employee Retirement: Death Benefits | Senate Rules |
| SB 355 | Baines | Regulations: Economic Analysis | Senate Gov.
<p>| SB 436 | Corral | Public Works: prevailing wages | Senate Labor |
| SB 483 | Calderon | UC and CSU: Summer Session Fees | Senate Education |
| SB 493 | Probst | State Surplus Property | Senate Appropriations |
| SB 497 | Rubio | State Agency: Public Contacts | Assembly Rules |
| SB 564 | Hernandez | Local Roads: bond anticipation Notes | Senate Gov. &amp; Finance |
| SB 590 | Waters | Pension Reform: Defined Contribution (spol) | Senate PER |
| SB 691 | Waters | Public Employee Retirement, Social Security | Senate PER |
| SB 732 | Waters | Public Employee Pensions, Service Credit - repealed | Senate PER |
| SB 823 | Waters | Repeal Local Officials: Retirement | Senate PER |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 524</td>
<td>Wakeley</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement Restatement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 535</td>
<td>Wakeley</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement Restatement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 536</td>
<td>Wakeley</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement: Defined/Contribution New Employees (spot)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 537</td>
<td>Wakeley</td>
<td>Public Employees Retirement: Contracting Agencies (spot)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 538</td>
<td>Wakeley</td>
<td>Public Employees Retirement: Defined Contribution Employees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 539</td>
<td>Corea</td>
<td>California School Corp: Military Academies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 540</td>
<td>Filler</td>
<td>State Regulations: Effect on Small Business</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Env &amp; Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 541</td>
<td>Vargas</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement Benefits (spot)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 542</td>
<td>Redford</td>
<td>Bonds: Fixed or unmodified use</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate &amp; Gov Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 543</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Health Care: Nonprofit Training</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 544</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Private Colleges: Non-English speaking students</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Business &amp; Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 545</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>State Regulations: Legislative Approval</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate &amp; Gov Org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 546</td>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Public Contracts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 547</td>
<td>Delucchi</td>
<td>Local Military Funding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 548</td>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>PER: Executive Retirement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate PER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 549</td>
<td>Sen. V. Comm</td>
<td>Veterans: Education Benefits for Dependents</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 550</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Public Contracts: University of California</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 551</td>
<td>Vargas</td>
<td>Public Employee Retirement: Social Security</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senate Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 552</td>
<td>Vargas</td>
<td>Public Employee Org: Consultant Pay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BILL TRACKED BY THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE: BUDGET BILLS**

- **AB 52**: Buninfield | Budget Act of 2011 | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **AB 55**: Budget Com | Education Finance: Budget Act of 2011 | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **AB 57**: Budget Com | Budget Bill Jr (amends SB 69, the main budget bill passed in March) | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **AB 58**: Budget Com | Budget Bill Jr (amends SB 69, the main budget bill passed in March) | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **SB 114**: Budget Com | Education | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **SB 69**: Leno | Budget Act of 2011 | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **SB 70**: Budget Com | Education Finance: Budget Act of 2011 | x | x | x | x | Senate Floor
- **SCA 4**: Steinberg | The Schools and Social Security Protection Act of 2011 |

*Vetoed* **Concurrence**: The bill needs approval by the house of origin if it has been amended in the second house. If the author is unable to move the bill as amended by the other house, the author requests "concurrence" and the formation of a conference committee.

**Status**

Legislative Matrix 6211.xlsx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>First House</th>
<th>Second House</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Place One</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Place One</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dualities</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The bill was placed in the inactive file, held in the committee, vetoed, its hearing was cancelled, or it did not meet legislative deadlines.

**Held:** The bill is currently moving through the legislative process, but could receive rule waivers and continue to be tracked by the Chancellor's Office.

**Reconsidered:** The bill was heard in committee or on the floor and did not pass. Reconsideration may have been granted.

Contact: Justin T. Sullivan, Governmental Relations – jsullivan@cccco.edu – 916.374.2547

Copies of these bills and legislative committee analyses can be found at www.callege.org.
LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION REVIEW OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Stuart Drown, Executive Director, Little Hoover Commission

Item 5.5

Issue
The Little Hoover Commission is currently conducting a review of the California Community Colleges. The Commission’s Executive Director, Stuart Drown, will provide a presentation on the project’s objectives, process, and timeline.

Background
The Little Hoover Commission is an independent state oversight agency that was created in 1962. The Commission's mission is to investigate state government operations and – through reports, recommendations and legislative proposals – promote efficiency, economy and improved service. The Commission is currently engaged in an examination of the California Community Colleges. A description of the project, provided by the Commission, follows:

Description of Study

The Little Hoover Commission is reviewing California’s community college system. California’s community college system is the nation’s largest higher education system, responsible for providing basic skills education, workforce training, and preparation for transfer to 4-year universities, as well as vocational and life-long learning opportunities. The community college system plays a critical role in training the state’s future workforce, and is under increasing pressure from declining budgets and growing demand. The Commission will study how the community college system’s governance structure and financing are aligned to serve its multifaceted mission, and make recommendations for improvement, if warranted.

When the Commission last reviewed the state’s community college system in 2000, it found enormous potential in the state’s community colleges’ ability to meet individual and community needs, but also identified some barriers. The Commission recommended a number of measures to strengthen community colleges’ ability to reach that potential, including improving teacher quality, ensuring universal access, realigning funding to drive student success and strengthening the governance of the community college system.
In its 1986 study, the Commission reviewed the adequacy of financial accountability for the community college system and made a number of recommendations to improve the organization, management and financial accountability of the system.

Staff:  
Erik Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor for Programs
RECOGNITION FOR DEBORAH MALUMED, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RECOGNITION
Presentation: Scott Himelstein, President, Board of Governors

Item 6.1

Issue

This item acknowledges the leadership and dedication of Dr. Deborah Malumed, Immediate Past President of the Board of Governors.
RECOGNITION FOR THE PAST PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT SENATE FOR
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

RECOGNITION
Presentation: Scott Himelstein, President, Board of Governors
Jack Scott, Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Linda Michalowski, Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs

Item 6.2

Issue
This item recognizes Alex Pader, the 2010-11 President of the Student Senate for California Community Colleges.
UPDATE ON THE CALIFORNIA STEM LEARNING NETWORK (CSLNET)

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Chris Roe, CSLNet, Chief Executive Officer

Item 7.1

Issue

The Board will hear a presentation by Chris Roe, Chief Executive Officer of the California Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Learning Network (CSLNet). Mr. Roe is a nationally recognized leader and speaker on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education with a proven track record in growing organizations that focus on improving student opportunities in STEM, especially for underrepresented students.

Background

CSLNet was launched in 2008 with a planning grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation. Since that time, CSLNet leadership and stakeholders have been developing a robust statewide network that advances CSLNet's vision for all students to graduate from high school with the STEM knowledge and skills required for success in postsecondary education, work, and their daily lives.

CSLNet aims to address California's workforce needs and better prepare our state's students to contribute to a vibrant California economy by:

- Increasing interest and competencies among all K-14 California students in STEM disciplines (with an emphasis on critical thinking, innovation, and use of information technologies),
- Ensuring all California students are college and career ready, without the need for remediation upon graduation from high school, with a greater number of students pursuing STEM-related degrees and careers, and
- Building a network that connects existing assets and develop new capacity to innovate, scale and sustain effective STEM teaching and learning.

The STEM Challenge

To maintain an economy driven by innovation and ingenuity, it is essential that California's students are college and career ready and possess the skills and abilities required in the 21st century. STEM skills are
increasingly necessary to engage in a knowledge-based economy and in daily decision-making. There is solid evidence to suggest that the fastest-growing and highest-wage jobs in future years will be in STEM fields. Workers in these fields must use STEM skills for problem solving in a wide range of industries. However, as the need for solid STEM skills is growing, the achievement gap is also growing. California lags other states in math and science proficiency ratings, and the nation as a whole falls behind many of its international peers.

In OECD's PISA 2009 rankings of international secondary education performance, the United States ranked 32nd (slightly below the international average) in Mathematics and 23rd (at about the international average) in Science. (Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development)


In 2008, STEM-related degrees and completions accounted for 12 percent of all higher education degrees and completions. (California Postsecondary Education Commission)

The United States has fallen from first to eleventh place in the OECD in the fraction of 25-34 year olds that has graduated high school. The older portion of the U.S. workforce ranks first among OECD populations of the same age. (OECD, 2009)

According to the American College Testing (ACT) College Readiness report, 78 percent of high school graduates did not meet the readiness benchmark levels for one or more entry-level college courses in mathematics, science, reading and English. (American College Testing)

Sixty-nine percent of United States public school students in fifth through eighth grade are taught mathematics by a teacher without a degree or certificate in mathematics. (National Center for Educational Statistics)

Ninety-three percent of United States public school students in fifth through eighth grade are taught the physical sciences by a teacher without a degree or certificate in the physical sciences. (National Center for Educational Statistics)

Seventy-five percent of the 50 fastest growing occupations in California require STEM skills with 70 percent of these jobs paying more than the state's median wage of $18.12/hour. (Labor Market Information Division, Employment Development Department)

California ranked 43rd or lower across all states in mathematics and science proficiency in grades 4 and 8 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005)
Item 7.2

Issue

The Board of Governors will be provided with a summary on the most current student enrollment and course offering statistics through the end of Fall 2010.
Item 7.3

Issue

Board members will report on their activities since the last Board meeting.
Update from the California State Board of Education

INFORMATION AND REPORTS
Presentation: Mike Kirst, President, California State Board of Education
Sue Burr, Executive Director, California State Board of Education and Education Advisor to the Governor

Item 8.1

Issue

The President of the State Board of Education (SBE), Dr. Mike Kirst, and the SBE Executive Director, Sue Burr, will provide an update on the activities of the SBE.

Background

The State Board of Education (SBE), the governing and policy-making body of the California Department of Education sets K-12 education policy in the areas of standards, instructional materials, assessment, and accountability. In addition, the SBE adopts textbooks for grades K-8, adopts regulations to implement legislation, and has authority to grant waivers of the Education Code. The SBE is comprised of 11 members, appointed by the Governor.

In July, 2010, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges held a joint meeting with the SBE to facilitate greater coordination of policies. At the meeting, the two boards discussed: 1) the California Early Assessment Program; and 2) Career Technical Education.

At today’s meeting, Dr. Kirst and Ms. Burr will provide information on the SBE’s recent activities and future plans. Biographical information for the two presenters is provided below:

Mike Kirst

Governor Jerry Brown appointed Dr. Mike Kirst to serve as President of the SBE in January 2011. Dr. Kirst is a Professor Emeritus of Education at Stanford University where he has been on the faculty since 1969. Kirst received his Ph.D. in political economy and government from Harvard. Before joining the Stanford University faculty, Kirst held several positions with the federal government, including Staff Director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment and Poverty, and Director of Program Planning for Elementary and Secondary Education at the U.S. Office of Education. He was a former president of the California State Board of Education. His latest books are, From High School to College with Andrea Venezia (2004) and Political Dynamics of American Education (2009). Dr. Kirst is a member of both the National Academy of Education and the International Academy of Education.
In addition to her responsibilities as Executive Director of the SBE, Ms. Burr also advises the Governor on education policy, legislation and budget matters, student college readiness, teacher credentialing, early childhood education issues and school construction. Ms. Burr has served as the executive director of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association since 2006, after serving as the association’s governmental relations director from 2003 to 2006. She was the assistant superintendent for business services with the Elk Grove Unified School District from 2000 to 2003. She served as the undersecretary of education under Governor Gray Davis from 1999 to 2000, also serving as interim secretary from March 2000 to August 2000. Burr was the co-director of the California State University Institute for Education Reform from 1995 to 1999, a principal consultant for the Senate Education Committee from 1991 to 1994, and a principal consultant for the Senate Appropriations Committee from 1986 to 1991.

Staff: Erik Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor for Programs