Name: Ryan McElhinney
Organization: Community College League
Phone #: (916) 245-5039
Email: ryan@ccleague.org

Subject: Equalizing the audit fee with the credit rate.

Problem: Currently the audit fee to attend a class at a California community college is $15 a unit, while $46 per unit is the credit fee. This leads to a loss of revenue for the colleges since they receive no state apportionment for audit students; the only funding for these students is the $15 per-unit fee. In a time of limited resources, our colleges cannot afford to permit students to audit a class at one-third of the fee charged to credit students, and should receive the additional funding which this change would provide.

Policy Solutions: Adjust the audit fee to be consistent with the credit fee so that, as the credit fee rises, the audit fee will be automatically adjusted. In addition, the fee language should include a higher (full-cost) fee for non-residents for consistency with the credit fee for nonresidents.

Outcomes/Benefits: Would make it easier for students to audit classes that they do not need credit for.
## Possible Supporters:
- Academic Senate
- Chief Instructional Officers
- California Federation of Teachers
- California Teachers Association
- Student Senate for California Community Colleges

## Possible Oppositions:
None.

## Previous Related Legislation:
None.
In 2003, as a result of an audit showing “non-compliant” concurrent enrollment programs, the California Community Colleges’ ability to serve students via this model was severely restricted. In addition, several financial disincentives and barriers were implemented that have since limited the ability of community college districts to expand concurrent enrollment offerings. These barriers include, among others, a cap on summer school enrollment, open-course requirements, and a cap on units allowed per semester without fees.

Concurrent/dual enrollment continues to be one of the most effective models for increasing student preparation and success in college-level coursework. It provides students the opportunity to enroll in college courses and earn college credit while still enrolled in high school. A student is allowed to enroll concurrently in a community college as a "special admit" while still attending high school, if his/her school district determines that the pupil would benefit from "advanced scholastic or vocational work." Currently, special-admit students have typically been advanced pupils seeking more challenging coursework or pupils whose high schools do not provide Advanced Placement (AP) or honors courses. Expanding the definition of those who could benefit from advanced work to include at-risk students has proven in many states to reduce the need for remedial coursework when students arrive at college. This program has also increased student retention in the collegiate setting and has reduced time-to-degree for many students.

**Ed Code §§:** 48800, 76001 and 76002.
The League would suggest any or all of the following policy changes to be included in any piece of legislation. This material is based on staff review of extensive research by the Education Commission of the States which looked at states that have adopted more comprehensive concurrent/dual enrollment programs.

(List in order of priority)

1. Eliminate the 5% limitation on students from a single grade at a high school, except physical education or other recreational courses, who can attend summer school at a community college.
2. Specify that concurrent enrollment is allowed for both “at-risk” and high-achieving students (who may be attending a rural high school which cannot provide the high-level courses that they seek).
3. Increase the maximum units from 11 to 15 that high school students can take while remaining exempt from fees.
4. Specify that community college districts may waive all other fees (q.v. health fees, transportation fees, etc.) for concurrent/dual enrollment students.
5. Encourage high schools and colleges to award both secondary and postsecondary credit for successful completion of approved college-level courses rather than current law which allows the local school and community college governing boards to determine if dual credit will be awarded.
6. Eliminate the requirement that community colleges can only teach on campuses, which are open to the public (which effectively eliminates the possibility of teaching on the high school campus during regular school hours).
7. Allow community college districts to collect some percentage of FTES apportionment for concurrent enrollment courses taught at a high school.
8. Expand data on concurrent enrollment in annual reporting.
Outcomes/Benefits:

Research has consistently shown that concurrent enrollment provides rigorous, supportive and career-focused pathways that help at-risk youth to successfully transition to college. A 2012 report by the Community College Research Center evaluated the success of the Concurrent Course Initiative, funded by the Irvine Foundation, and found that “the participating students -- those facing serious barriers to education and advancement -- had better high school and college outcomes than comparison students.”[1]

Concurrent enrollment is an important way for community college and school districts to work together to align curriculum and increase academic opportunities for both high-risk students and those who seek more advanced courses. These programs have been stymied over the past four years due to the recession and the heavy demands made upon community colleges. Now that the state is in a healthier fiscal situation, districts are eager to work with their school district colleagues to address this issue and provide more opportunities for high school students to benefit from these programs.

Possible Supporters:

California Chamber of Commerce
California Federation of Teachers
California State University
Community College Districts
California Manufacturers and Technology Association (CMTA)
Education Trust – West
NAACP
MALDEF

Possible Oppositions:

Department of Finance (unless FTES apportionment is reduced)
California Teachers Association

Previous Related Legislation:

AB 1451 (Holden)
AB 2352 (Chesbro)
AB 1146 (Morell)
SB 650 (Lowenthal)
AB 160 (Portantino)
SB 1303 (Runner)
California Community Colleges
2015 Legislative Proposal

Name: Cris McCullough
Phone #: 916-324-5646
Email: cmccullough@cccco.edu
Organization: Academic Affairs

Subject: Specialized Public Safety Training at Community Colleges

Problem: There are three distinct categories of public safety training offered at the community colleges. The first category includes programs and courses for students preparing for a certificate, degree, or transfer, or for obtaining entry-level skills and knowledge in preparation for future careers in public safety areas such as Administration of Justice (2105.00) and Fire Technology (2133.00). The second category includes specialized academies to meet employment standards for entry level employment requirements including the Police (POST) Academy (2105.50) and Fire Academy (2133.50). The third category may require legislation. This category includes a wide range of courses offered primarily to current public safety employees in areas such as police, corrections, parole, home land security, fire, and wild land fire. These courses provide essential and specialized up-date training. Current Title 5 regulations require these courses to be open in order to receive apportionment. Having open courses in these sensitive areas creates security and safety issues for both sworn officers and citizens.

Policy Solution: Similar to apprenticeship training courses, designate specialized public safety training courses designed for currently employed public safety employees as being both legally closed and repeatable as new technologies, techniques, and processes for protecting the public become available. Furthermore, similar to apprenticeship programs, waive enrollment fees for California public safety employee authorized training, and award college credit where appropriate. Curriculum approval and state apportionment would continue to be based on the standards and regulations established in the California Education Cod (CEC), Title 5, and the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH).
## Outcomes/Benefits:
Closing specialized training courses for California public safety officers in areas such as weapons training and homeland security will protect the health and safety of both officers and California citizens. Community colleges in partnership with local safety agencies have demonstrated the ability to offer cost effective and quality public safety training courses and programs. The current “open” requirement for apportionment allows people to participate at a level that is inappropriate for their knowledge and skills and provides access to information and techniques that can be used against officers that are trying to protect California citizens. The benefit would be a better trained and prepared public safety workforce which will directly improve the health and safety of communities and individuals.

## Possible Supporters:
POST, State Fire Marshall’s Office, City, County, and State Fire and Police Agencies, community colleges, CCPOA, Correctional facilities

## Possible Oppositions:
Depending upon the structure of the legislation, POST, State Fire Marshall’s Office, City, County, and State Fire and Police Agencies, community colleges, CCPOA, Correctional facilities

## Previous Related Legislation:
I am not aware of prior legislation, which does not mean there isn’t any.
Subject: Reforming Cal Grants to Better Serve Community College Students

Problem: California’s financial aid system has not been effective for California’s community college students. While two-thirds of California’s higher education students are enrolled in a California community college, they only receive one-third of the awards and six percent of the funds. This occurs because Cal Grant awards are primarily tuition-based, which means that community colleges students receive less grant money than awardees in the University of California, the California State University or at a private college.

The result is a system of financial aid that does not serve California’s most needy students. For example, a study by The Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS) showed that after all financial aid awards are taken into account, the expected family contribution is greater for a student at Berkeley City College than it is at CSU East Bay or UC Berkeley. This occurs because the cost of attendance at college is far greater than the fees upon which the “access” award of $1,648 is based. Since community college fees are so low (and often waived by a BOG waiver), community college students do not receive sufficient funds to support their real access needs while continuing their education; consequently, the vast majority are forced to work while attending classes.

The lack of support reduces a community college student’s chance for succeeding in meeting his/her educational goals because these students must work to support themselves while attending college. If the state of California were to invest in its most socio-economically disadvantaged students, they would be able to take more classes each semester and complete their education more expeditiously.
Policy Solutions: Because community college students are only eligible to receive the access portion of Cal Grant B, any policy solutions to this problem would focus on that award.

- Increase number of competitive Cal Grants.
- Increase Cal Grant B access award.
- Expand window of eligibility to qualify for the entitlement program.

Outcomes/Benefits: Serving more of the state’s Cal Grant eligible students would help community college students move closer to obtaining full time enrollment. This would increase their chance of success and help more Californians obtain a college degree.

Possible Supporters: Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges
California Competes
California State Student Association
California Student Aid Commission
California Federation of Teachers
California Teachers Association
Campaign for College Opportunity
Education Trust West
Los Angeles NAACP
National Council of La Raza
Public Advocates
Southern California College Access Network
Student Senate for California Community Colleges
The Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS)
University of California Student Association
Young Invincible

Possible Oppositions: Department of Finance
Previous Related Legislation:

Legislation to increase the access award:

- AB 175 (Price) would have indexed the access award to inflation but was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

- AB 1364 (Ting) originally would have increased the access award from the current $1,648 to $5,900 and indexed it to inflation. In Assembly Appropriations Committee, the increase was reduced to $1,710. The bill passed the Assembly but was eventually held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Legislation to increase the number of competitive awards:

- AB 1976 (Quirk-Silva) originally would have increased the number of competitive Cal Grant awards from 22,500 to 50,000 and would have given the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) flexibility to ensure those awards were fully utilized. To gain the approval of the Assembly Appropriations Committee, amendments were inserted to delete the increased number of competitive Cal Grant awards. In its final version, which is on the Governor’s desk, it only contains language to provide flexibility to the CSAC in awarding grants.

Legislation to increase the window of entitlement:

- AB 1241 (Weber) would have extended the window of eligibility of entitlement from one to three years after high school. To gain approval in the Assembly Appropriations Committee, amendments were inserted to narrow the window from three years to two; the bill was then held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2566 (Weber) would have increased the window of eligibility from one to two years, but was held in Assembly Appropriations Committee.