



# The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

DATE: November 16-17, 2015

SUBJECT: 2016 State Legislative Program		Item Number: 2.14	
		Attachment: Yes	
CATEGORY:	External Relations	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
Recommended By:	 Vincent W. Stewart, Vice Chancellor	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
Approved for Consideration:	 Brice W. Harris, Chancellor	Action	X
		Information	

**ISSUE:** Board of Governors 2016 sponsored legislation.

**BACKGROUND:** The Board of Governors (BOG) is requested to adopt a package of sponsored legislation, commonly referred to as the State Legislative Program, for 2016 based on the recommendations of the Chancellor’s Office, with input and guidance from the Consultation Council and the State Legislative Program Task Force. Historically, the BOG has considered its annual State Legislative Program as an action item during its November meeting in order to allow Chancellor’s Office staff sufficient time to identify authors and develop bill language prior to the beginning of the legislative session in January of each year. Due to the recess or adjournment of the Legislature in September, it is not practical to first present the State Legislative Program as an information item during the September BOG meeting, nor is it practical to delay action until January. Therefore, the State Legislative Program is both presented and considered as an action item in November of each year. Board approval of this item, however, does not prevent the Board from adding additional sponsored legislation in the coming months. *(Background contd.)*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Board of Governors approve this item.

***(Background contd.)***

This year, a total of six proposals, two submitted from external stakeholders and four developed internally by the Chancellor's Office, were submitted for consideration as possible BOG sponsored legislation. The State Legislative Program Task Force, which is comprised of members and designees of the Consultation Council, reviewed the proposals on October 6, 2015, and the proposals were presented to the Consultation Council on October 8, 2015. Both the Task Force and the Council are advisory to the Chancellor's Office for this purpose and based on discussions with both groups, as well as further review by Chancellor's Office staff, we are bringing five proposals to the Board for consideration as sponsored legislation in 2016.

The BOG's State Legislative Program typically addresses statewide policy priorities, as well as technical issues that require a statutory change to address a system wide need. In accordance with the Legislative Principles and the BOG Standing Orders, proposals are evaluated based on the current political and economic climate and steer away from local district issues or collective bargaining matters. The proposals recommended for BOG sponsorship in 2016 are presented below in conceptual form. Legislative language for these proposals will be developed upon approval by the BOG and in consultation with potential legislative authors.

Attached for your reference is a copy of the Statement of Legislative Principles.

**2016 Proposals for BOG Sponsored Legislation**

1) Adult Education Stakeholder Involvement

This proposal, which the Chancellor's Office would seek to co-sponsor with the California Department of Education (CDE), would amend existing law to specify that regional adult education consortia consult with community college and K-12 stakeholders, including faculty, teachers, principals, administrators, classified staff, local bargaining units of the districts, and students. These provisions would be similar to language currently found in state statute regarding the K-12 Local Control Funding Formula planning policy. The purpose of this change is to address concerns expressed by some stakeholders that input into the adult education planning process has been uneven across the state. The proposal would better ensure that processes for stakeholder feedback would be consistent region by region.

Source: California School Employees Association

2) Audit Fee

This proposal would adjust the audit fee to be consistent with the credit fee so that as the credit fee changes the audit fee will be automatically adjusted. In addition, the proposal would seek a higher (full-cost) audit fee for non-residents in order to establish consistency with the credit fee for non-residents.

Currently the audit fee to attend a class at a California community college is \$15 per unit, whereas the credit fee is \$46 per unit. This leads to a loss of revenue for our colleges since they receive no state apportionment funding for audit students. The only revenue for these students is the \$15 per unit audit fee. Even though we have recently experienced a reinvestment in our community colleges, we will no doubt encounter another economic downturn and must plan accordingly. California's community colleges cannot afford to allow students to audit a class at one-third the fee charged to credit students and should receive the additional funding this change would provide.

Source: Chancellor's Office

### 3) Cal Grant Program

This proposal would amend current law to increase the maximum Cal Grant B access award from \$1,656 up to \$3,000 per year and increase the number of new Cal Grant Competitive awards from 25,750 to 30,000 beginning in the 2016-17 fiscal year. The proposal would also seek to increase the maximum Cal Grant C award from \$547 to \$3,000.

Cal Grant B targets California's lowest income students, and Cal Grant C provides support for students who pursue one or two-year Career Technical Education certificates, credentials and degrees. Both Cal Grant B and C programs provide assistance with educational costs such as living expenses, books, supplies, uniforms, and transportation. However, the value of these awards has diminished over time and has not kept pace with the escalating cost of a college education.

In addition, this proposal would seek to remove barriers to eligibility for the Community Colleges Cal Grant Transfer Entitlement program. Current eligibility criteria require that only community college students under the age of 28 may apply if they enroll at a four-year college within one year of completing a transfer program. This proposal would seek to provide community college students with more than one year of a "gap in attendance" when transferring to a four-year institution and would increase the age limit from 28 to 30. In many cases community college students need time to work or relocate and require more than one year between the time they complete their community college coursework and transfer to a four-year institution.

Source: Chancellor's Office

### 4) Enrollment Priority for Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), Foster Youth and Former Foster Youth

This proposal would amend current law to extend the existing enrollment priority for Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), foster youth and former foster youth. The statutorily authorized enrollment priority for these students is scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2017. For the most part, these are at-risk, underprepared, first-generation college students who are often burdened with significant educational, financial and personal disadvantages. There is the increased risk of these students dropping out of college if they

are unsuccessful in enrolling in the classes they need to achieve their educational goals, which is the rationale for providing the enrollment priority.

Source: Chancellor's Office

#### 5) Workforce Program Reporting Requirements

This proposal would align the state Economic and Workforce Development (EWD) program accountability metrics with those of the 2014 Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Currently, state funded EWD programs are supported by three separate funding streams (SB 1402, SB 1070, and Perkins), each with their own accountability metrics attached to them. The three programs have progressively become similar in scope as a result of state and federal policy shifts. However, the persistent misalignment of accountability metrics between WIOA and the state funded programs creates unnecessary, sometimes duplicative and inconsistent reporting requirements for Chancellor's Office staff and local program data collectors. This proposal is one of the recommendations of the Board of Governor's Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy to streamline and align state and federal EWD program outcome metrics.

Source: Chancellor's Office

Attachments:

Statement of Legislative Principles