Agenda

I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC SPEAKERS*

III. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Federal Update
   B. State Update
   C. Bills Update: Consideration for Support
      - AB 19 (Santiago) The California Community College Promise
      - SB 539 (de Leon) Community College Completion Incentive Grant
      - SB 54 (de Leon) The California Value Act
      - AB 387 (Thurmond) Minimum Wage: Health Professional Interns
      - SB 694 (Newman) California Community Colleges: Veteran Resource Centers

IV. OLD BUSINESS

V. DISCUSSION

VI. SUMMARY– NEXT MEETING .................................................................Mike Fong

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*Members of the public are allotted three minutes time to address the agenda issues.
If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternate formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, for whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting. To make such a request, please contact the Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees at 213/891-2044 no later than 12 p.m. (noon) on the Tuesday prior to the Committee meeting.
AB 19 (Santiago)
The California Community College Promise

Bill Summary
AB 19 creates the California Community College (CCC) Promise Program to provide tuition-free education at a CCC for one academic year for all first-time, full-time (12 units or more) students.

Existing Law
The CCC Board of Governor’s Fee Waiver (BOGFW) waives enrollment fees ($46/unit) for students who (1) meet residency criteria; (2) maintain minimum academic and progress standards; and (3) demonstrate financial need via various methods (Education Code § 76300).

Background
In 2015, former President Obama proposed two years of tuition-free community college for eligible students. Modeled off the Tennessee Promise (which provides two years tuition-free at a community or technical college in Tennessee to certain state residents) and California’s own Long Beach Promise (which provides one year tuition-free to eligible students), Obama’s proposal has prompted extensive debate across the nation on college access and affordability.

Realizing the benefits of such programs, many community college districts throughout California—and across the U.S.—have implemented local Promise Programs.¹ These Promise Programs have been demonstrated to:

- Expand access to financial aid;
- Promote equity;
- Increase enrollment;
- Improve academic performance; and
- Boost college completion rates.

¹ http://bit.ly/2JA3EQV

Need for AB 19
In 2025, California faces an estimated shortage of one million college degree and certificate holders needed to sustain the state’s workforce.

To help meet this demand, AB 19 enacts a CCC Promise Program to provide a year of tuition-free education to all first-time, full-time, CCC students.

By creating a college-going culture throughout California, this measure will expand access to financial aid, promote equity, increase enrollment, help improve academic performance, and boost completion rates.

Support
Los Angeles Community College District (sponsor)
Los Rios Community College District (sponsor)
Peralta Community College District (sponsor)
San Diego Community College District (sponsor)
San Francisco Community College District (sponsor)

Opposition
None on file

For More Information
Brandon Gaytán
Assemblymember Miguel Santiago
916.319.2053 | brandon.gaytan@asm.ca.gov
SB 539 (De León) Community College Completion Incentive Grant
As Amended April 3, 2017

PURPOSE:

Ensure California Community College students have sufficient financial aid to enable them to complete a degree, an associate degree for transfer, or a career pathway in a timely manner.

BACKGROUND:

While tuition/fees at California’s Community Colleges (CCC) are the lowest in the nation, CCC students still struggle with the total cost of attending a community college. According to the California Student Aid Commission, “non-tuition” costs such as textbooks, transportation, food, and housing exceed $18,000 annually for CCC students living independently.\(^1\) Furthermore research reveals a student’s ability to pay the full cost of attendance is an important factor in his or her success. Students who do not have enough money to meet their total cost of attendance often make decisions that undermine their ability to complete. For example, they chose not to buy all of the required books for their classes or work more hours, at the expense of studying, to meet their housing and food costs.\(^2\)

A recent report by the Institute for College Access and Success highlights the lackluster completion rates of CCC students and how the student’s lack of financial resources affects his or her ability to complete a degree program, associate degree for transfer, or career pathway. If a student does not enroll full-time (12 units or more), it takes him or her longer to complete, which ultimately delays his or her ability to enter the workforce.

Only 32% of CCC students enrolled full-time in Fall 2013. This percentage is one of the lowest in the nation for a community college system. A recent survey by the Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS) of CCC students states: “most students said that their need to work for pay kept them from enrolling in as many courses as they wanted to take.” Students’ survey responses also stated that additional financial aid grants would allow them to enroll in more courses and spend more of their time toward completing school (i.e., studying and visiting the library). TICAS further argues that “enrollment status is a key driver of student success, as students who enroll full-time are far more likely to graduate than those who do not.”\(^3\)

In additional to more financial aid, a key component to success is the student’s ability to “stay on track” and take the necessary, relevant units to complete a degree, associate degree for transfer or a career pathway. CCC program completion rates have declined slightly in the last few years. For example,

\(^1\)Aiding Success: The Role of Federal and State Financial Aid in Supporting California Community College Students by the Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS), 2017.
\(^2\)TICAS, 2017
\(^3\)TICAS, 2017
program completion rates were 49% for 2014-15 and 47% in 2015-16. Likewise, less than one-half of CCC students complete a degree to transfer within six years.

Over the last five years, the Legislature and the Governor have invested heavily in CCC student success efforts. CCCs have received an additional $577 million for student success programs, including student equity plans, basic skills, extended opportunity programs and services, and institutional effectiveness. All of these initiatives are designed to increase student completion, particularly for low-income and underserved students. It is unclear, however, if all of these initiatives are working together in a cohesive, integrated manner to establish a system focused on student completion. For example, at a particular community college, do administrators and faculty associated with each one of these initiatives work together to design a singular system of assessment, advising, and support services for students?

Research indicates that “most community colleges are poorly designed for students, who often have difficulty navigating the myriad of choices available to them when selecting academic programs and courses. Due to this plethora of choices, students often end up taking a winding path through college, characterized by excess units, extra years in college, and high dropout rates.” The Legislative Analyst Office argues that colleges must change how they implement student services, instruction and administrative practices.

In the 2017 January Budget, the Governor put forth a proposal to implement “Guided Pathways” at CCCs. This initiative is meant to implement systemic change at each college to do the following: improve student knowledge of what courses to take to meet their completion objectives; monitor student progress toward completion; and develop clear learning outcomes for students. According to the Governor, “the expectation is to improve completion rates, reduce-time-to degree, increase California students’ employment opportunities, and reduce student debt.”

In order for the guided pathway initiative to work, CCCs must integrate their existing student success programs - student equity plans, basic skills, extended opportunity programs and services, etc. – to support a cohesive system focused on student completion.

California’s future economic success depends upon an educated and skilled workforce. According to the Public Policy Institute of California, current college graduation rates will hit the state’s workforce with a shortage of 1.1 million workers who qualify for jobs that require a bachelor’s degree in 2030.

CCC enroll approximately 1.2 million students. CCCs are a critical piece in eliminating the projected shortfall of bachelor degrees. More CCC students must transfer to a four year university or complete a career pathway that will enable them to earn a higher paying job. Currently, less than 50% of CCC students complete a degree or transfer related outcomes. Likewise, students who complete higher level career technical education coursework earn 13.4% more, on average, than students who do not complete this coursework.

Higher education is the passport to opportunity and economic success for all California children. The state’s ability to make CCCs more affordable and create a system focused on completion is a key component to the growth of California’s economy.

---

42017-18 Budget: Higher Education Analysis, Legislative Analyst Office, February 2017
5California Community College Student Success Scorecard 2016
62017-18 Budget: Higher Education Analysis, Legislative Analyst Office, February 2017
72017-18 Budget: Higher Education Analysis, Legislative Analyst Office, February 2017
8The 2017-18 Governor’s Budget Summary
9California Community College Student Success Scorecard 2016
PROPOSAL:

- Establishes the Community College Completion Incentive Grant (CCIG), which provides an additional $4,000 in financial aid to CCC students receiving the existing Full-Time Student Success Grant, if they complete 15 units. With this additional funding, an eligible CCC Student will receive a total of approximately $10,700 in financial aid from state and federal sources.¹⁰

- Establishes the Guided Pathways Initiative and require participating CCCs to integrate existing student success programs with the purpose of increasing student completion.

Support:

For more information, please contact: Kimberly Rodriguez, Office of Senator De León, at (916) 651-4024.

¹⁰Assumes the California Community College Student receives the federal Pell Grant, Cal Grant B Access Award, and the existing CCC Full-Time Success Grant.
PURPOSE
To protect the safety and well-being of all Californians by ensuring that state and local resources are not used to fuel mass deportations, separate families, and ultimately hurt California’s economy.

BACKGROUND
The President’s Executive Orders and the accompanying Department of Homeland Security memorandums outline a mass deportation strategy that will encompass a broad category of immigrants. The federal government intends to use local law enforcement as “force multipliers” of immigration agents, relying heavily on police to help them deport the greatest number of people possible. Aggressive federal immigration enforcement strategies are already underway by the new Administration. ICE arrests in courthouses and outside schools are an alarming new trend.

A relationship of trust between California’s immigrant residents and our state and local agencies, including police, schools, and hospitals, is essential to carrying out basic state and local functions. That trust is threatened when state and local agencies are involved in immigration enforcement.

A report by the University of Illinois published in 2013 found that “70 percent of undocumented immigrants reported they are less likely to contact law enforcement authorities if they were victims of a crime.” Furthermore, according to the Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles Chief of Police Charlie Beck has stated that “sexual assault reports have dropped 25% among the city’s Latino population since the beginning of 2017 compared with the same period last year, adding that reports of domestic violence have fallen by 10%. Similar decreases were not seen in reports of those crimes by other ethnic groups.”

California is already familiar with the harmful effects of entangling local law enforcement agencies with immigration enforcement. Prior to its termination, the discredited “Secure Communities” program (S-Comm) operated in California as an indiscriminate mass deportation program at great cost to California both financially and otherwise. According

---

1 Insecure Communities: Latino Perceptions of Police Involvement in Immigration Enforcement, Nik Theodore, Dep’t of Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago (May 2013)
to a report prepared by Justice Strategies in 2012, when the Secure Communities program was still active, California taxpayers spent an estimated $65 million annually to detain people for ICE.²

Currently, at least 65-75% of all deportations nationwide are the result of collaboration between state or local law enforcement agencies and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or Customs and Border Protection (CBP). In many localities, ICE is allowed to interview inmates for immigration purposes, review inmate logs, and search jail computers to gather addresses to conduct home raids. This collaboration invokes widespread fear in immigrant communities. For these reasons, it is necessary to evaluate the appropriate use of state and local resources for immigration enforcement purposes and recognize the devastating impact deportations have on a state with thousands of mixed status families, and a heavily immigrant workforce.

PROPOSAL
The California Values Act will provide essential safeguards to ensure that police, schools, health facilities, and courts remain accessible to Californians from all walks of life and that California’s limited resources are directed to matters of greatest concern to state and local governments.

1. **Safe Zones**—California schools, health facilities, public libraries, and courthouses will remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. Each shall establish policies that limit immigration enforcement on their premises to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law.

2. **Use of State/Local Resources**—State and local law enforcement agencies and school police and security departments will not engage in immigration enforcement. No state or local resources will be used to investigate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes. However, state and local law enforcement agencies can allow a person to be interviewed by ICE, transferred to ICE, and detained for ICE if there is a **judicial warrant**.

3. **Release Date Notifications**—Requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to report to the federal government release information of all serious and violent felons at least 60 days before they are released. Allows law enforcement to respond to notification requests from ICE for serious and violent felons.

4. **Taskforce Participation**—Local law enforcement will continue to be able to participate in multi-agency taskforces, such as those investigating human trafficking, cybersecurity, and drug trafficking, so long as immigration enforcement is not the primary purpose of the taskforce.

---

SUPPORT
Abriendo Puertas/Opening Doors
Advancement Project
Alliance San Diego
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
American Civil Liberties Union of California
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - California
Asian American Criminal Trial Lawyers Association
Asian Law Alliance
ASPIRE
Anti-Defamation League
Bill Wilson Center
California Academy of Family Physicians—North Bay Chapter
California Adolescent Health Collaborative
California Health+ Advocates
California Association for Bilingual Education
California Calls
California Catholic Conference, Inc.
California Central Valley Journey for Justice
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Federation of Teachers
Californians for Justice Education Fund
California La Raza Lawyers Association
California Labor Federation
California Partnership to End Domestic Violence
California State Student Association
California Teachers Association
Californians Together Coalition
Center for Gender & Refugee Studies
Center for Policy Initiatives
Central American Resource Center - Los Angeles
Centro Laboral de Graton
Children’s Defense Fund - CA
Common Sense Kids Action
Contra Costa County Social Justice Alliance of the Interfaith Council
Contra Costa’s Family Economic Security Partnership
Courage Campaign
CREDO
Dream Team Los Angeles
Dolores Huerta Foundation
Dr. Ref Rodrigues, LAUSD Board Member
Equality California
Esperanza Immigrant Rights Project of Catholic Charities of Los Angeles
Evergreen Teachers Association
Faith in the Valley
Filipino Youth Coalition
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
Inland Empire Immigrant Youth Coalition
Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles
Jewish Federation of the Sacramento Region
Jewish Public Affairs Committee of California
Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance
La Raza Roundtable de California
La Raza Law Student Association of UC Davis Law School
Latino and Latina Roundtable
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Legal Aid Association of California
Los Angeles County Democratic Party
Los Angeles County Supervisor Hilda Solis
Los Angeles County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Loyola Immigrant Justice Clinic
Marin Human Rights Commission
Mayor Eric Garcetti, City of Los Angeles
Mayor Casillas Salas, City of Chula Vista
Mayor Cecilia Valdez, City of San Pablo
Mayor Christopher L. Cabaldon, City of West Sacramento
Mayor Jim B. Clarke, City of Culver City
Mayor Kirsten Keith, City of Menlo Park
Mayor Libby Schaaf, City of Oakland
Mayor Miguel A. Pulido, City of Santa Ana
Mayor Robert Garcia, City of Long Beach
Mayor Susan Ornelas, City of Arcata
Mayor Ted Winterer, City of Santa Monica
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
Mi Familia Vota
Mixteco/Indigena Community Organizing Project
Monument Impact
Multi-faith Action Coalition
Muslim Student Association West
National Lawyers Guild, Los Angeles
North County Immigration Task Force of San Diego
National Council of Jewish Women California
National Day Laborer Organizing Network
National Immigration Law Center
Nikkei for Civil Rights & Redress
Nikkei Progressives
Orange County Immigrant Youth United
Our Family Coalition
Pangea Legal Services
Planned Parenthood of the Pacific Southwest
The Pride Law Firm
Redlands Area Democratic Club
San Diego Dream Team
San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium
San Diego La Raza Lawyers Association
San Joaquin Immigrant Youth Collective
San Jose Evergreen Community College District
Santa Barbara Women’s Political Committee
Santa Cruz County Immigrant Rights Project
Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network
SEIR UFCW
SEIU Local 1021
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Somos Mayfair
South Asian Network
Tongan American Youth Foundation
Town of Portola Valley
The Children’s Partnership
Training Occupational Development Educating Communities Legal Center
Unite Here
Utility Workers Union of America
Uplift
Village Connect, Inc.
Voices for Progress Education Fund
Warehouse Worker Resource Center
YWCA Glendale

*updated as of 5/1/2017

For more information, please contact Alexandra Salgado, (916) 651-4024,
Alexandra.Salgado@sen.ca.gov
Myth vs. Reality
SB 54 (De León) California Values Act

Senate Bill 54 will protect the safety and well-being of all Californians by ensuring that state and local resources are not commandeered by the federal government to fuel mass deportations, separate families, and ultimately hurt California’s economy. It will safeguard health facilities, schools, libraries, and courthouses from immigration enforcement so that every Californian has access to basic government services. In the interest of public safety, SB 54 will get state and local law enforcement out of the deportation business to ensure that the immigrant community continues to trust police. The California Values Act reaffirms the state’s commitment to valuing and protecting all of its residents, regardless of immigration status.

MYTH:
This bill will make California a sanctuary State.

REALITY:
This bill doesn’t offer Sanctuary. We can't stop ICE enforcement in our communities, but we can get out of the deportation business.

Police departments have worked hard to develop a relationship of trust with immigrant communities and the only way to maintain that relationship is to clearly distinguish between law enforcement and immigration enforcement. Otherwise, immigrants will be unlikely to report crimes or cooperate with investigations.

MYTH:
SB 54 shelters felons.

REALITY:
ICE can execute a warrant against anyone in our jails. ICE knows who’s in our jails because the agency automatically receives all fingerprint records when someone is booked.

AND under SB 54, our prison system will proactively inform ICE of release dates for serious and violent felons.
Sheriffs will also be able to tell ICE when serious and violent felons are going to be released so ICE can do its job.

The President says he will target criminal immigrants for his ambitious deportation plans, but the reality is that he has a very loose on the definition of criminal.

What SB 54 will do is stop illegally detaining people who aren't dangerous criminals and get local enforcement out of the business of assisting ICE track, arrest, and detain immigrants.

**MYTH:**

If ICE doesn't have access to the jails, they will arrest people out in the community and risk harm to the public.

**REALITY:**

ICE is already detaining people in our neighborhoods, including doing “collateral arrest” of anyone they encounter who may be undocumented. They will continue to do so regardless of our state policies.

Under Trump, ICE has already broken away from the DHS memorandum protecting sensitive locations (like schools and churches) from immigration enforcement. There is report after report of ICE picking up people close to schools, at hospitals, and while seeking domestic violence restraining orders at courthouses.

**MYTH:**

Local law enforcement agencies have to comply with ICE requests even if ICE doesn’t have a warrant.

**REALITY:**

An ICE detainer request is just that: a request. There is no legal requirement for local law enforcement to comply. The federal government has no legal right to force a department to hold anyone beyond the time when they are eligible for release from state or local custody.

Several courts have found that detaining people without a judicial warrant, i.e. without probable cause, violates 4th amendment and creates liability for local agencies.
SB 54 requires ICE to follow the law and get a judicial warrant. Judicial warrants are standard practice of our justice system and should be readily available for ICE to obtain if they are in fact pursuing criminals.

**MYTH:**

SB 54 will stop sheriffs and police departments from participating in joint taskforces with the federal government.

**REALITY:**

SB 54 states very clearly that local law enforcement can continue to be part of joint taskforces. The bill will not limit legitimate criminal task force operations intended to go after gang activity, human trafficking, and other criminal organizations.

**MYTH:**

California will lose all of its federal funding because of SB 54.

**REALITY:**

California is in full compliance now and will remain in full compliance with federal immigration laws.

The President’s Executive Order states that “sanctuary jurisdictions” are those in violation of 8 U.S. Code 1373. SB 54 is not in violation of that federal statute. In fact, the bill explicitly states compliance with Section 1373.

If the President still moved to cut funding, despite California’s compliance with Section 1373, there would be major Constitutional and 10th amendment issues that the State would raise to defend itself. The federal government cannot commandeer our resources to do its work.

The President may use federal funding to threaten us into participating, but that very participation comes at a cost of millions to our state and local law enforcement. For example, under the Secure Communities program, California taxpayers spent $65 million to help ICE with deportations.
IN BRIEF

Allied health professionals are required to work hundreds of unpaid clinical hours to successfully complete their training programs. This requirement creates a barrier for low-income students and working adults, which prevents them from entering into good middle-class jobs.

BACKGROUND

California has more than 600,000 allied healthcare professionals with employment expected to grow to one million by 2030. More than half of those occupations require a license or certification. These are careers like Respiratory Therapist, Vocational Nurse, Surgical Technologist, Medical Assistant and Certified Nursing Assistant. These jobs typically offer good wages and benefits providing a path to the middle class, but entry can be difficult as students are required to contribute significant hours of unpaid work to achieve their degrees.

Every year, more than 50,000 Californians are in training to become an allied health professional, and on average they tend to be white, older and predominantly female. Clinical hour requirements vary from as few as 160 hours for Medical Assistants to as many as 1850 hours for a Radiologic Technologist. The clinical hour requirement is in addition to in-classroom course work requirements meaning that some students are in school 30-50 hours a week plus the time they spend studying outside of their course work and clinical hours. In fact, most programs at the community college level recommend that students not work because of the demanding nature of the programs.

Requiring students to contribute significant hours of unpaid work is an unrealistic burden for individuals with families to support. This explains some of the racial and ethnic achievement gaps in Healthcare Career Technical Education Programs. The disparities in success for healthcare training programs result in a less culturally competent workforce with only 25% of the healthcare workforce being Latino, compared to 40% of California’s population. This is a problem because a number of studies have pointed to cultural competency as a key factor in better health outcomes.

Students in allied healthcare programs are not paid; however in traditionally male professions, individuals are compensated for their labor, even while in training. In healthcare once students show competency they are able to carry out the day to day functions of medical care with indirect supervision. This creates a direct benefit to the industry, while the worker receives no payment for their labor. In fact, we estimate that in California allied health professionals contribute up to 25 million unpaid clinical hours a year.

SOLUTION

This bill would provide that any person engaged in a period of supervised work experience to satisfy requirements for licensure, registration, or certification as an Allied Health Professional be subject to the minimum wage law.

By requiring healthcare providers to fairly compensate allied health professionals with at least the minimum wage, more individuals from underrepresented communities will be able to complete the required clinical training requirements for allied health professions, thereby increasing the overall numbers and diversity of the students in the pipeline.

SUPPORT

SEIU (Sponsor)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Taylor Jackson, Assembly Labor and Employment Committee
916-319-2091 | Taylor.Jackson@asm.ca.gov

---

1 Kemp, Help Wanted: Will California Miss Out on a Billion dollar Industry, The California Wellness Foundation
2 Bohn, McConville, and Gibson, PPIC, Career Technical Education in Health, 2016
3 Ibid

4 McConville, Bohn, Beck, PPIC, California’s Health Workforce Needs, 2014
SB 694 (Newman) Veteran Resource Centers

**FACT SHEET**

**Sponsor:** Senator Josh Newman  
**Staff Contact:** Aaron Skaggs, (916) 651-4029

**ISSUE**

Over 1.8 million veterans call California home, making California the state with the largest veteran population in the nation. Veterans who have completed their military service return home in search of rewarding and career-oriented employment. For the vast majority of veterans pursuing a college degree upon their return home, the path through higher education is via one of California’s 113 community colleges, which currently serve more than 70,000 veterans and active-duty service members. That number is expected to grow annually as more than 25,000 post-9/11 veterans per year transition back to civilian life in California.

Currently, there is no baseline standard across the California Community College system to ensure that every veteran receives sufficient support in support of his or her educational plans. Some community colleges have well-funded and fully staffed Veteran Resource Centers offering a wide array of critical services, while other colleges offer services that are rudimentary or, in some cases, basically nothing at all. Successful community college Veteran Resource Centers offer academic counseling, tutoring services, peer support, mentoring services, financial aid assistance, access to technology, and on-campus in navigating the VA eligibility and claims systems. These services are essential to the success of student veterans, and every student veteran deserves the same level of service, no matter where they return to, where their families reside, or where they decide to attend school.

**SOLUTION**

By ensuring a common set of functions and standards, SB 694 would specify a baseline level of service that each community college will offer to ensure that our veterans are receiving the support they need and deserve, regardless of which campus they attend. This will ensure that veterans are utilizing their G.I. Bill benefits in the most efficient manner while setting them up to be successful in their communities. The current circumstance of varying levels of support for student veterans from campus to campus is simply not acceptable. Veterans have served our country with honor and distinction and not providing them with these resources is a disservice and an abrogation of our shared obligation in deference to that service.

**SUPPORT**

(As amended 4/5/16)