I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC SPEAKERS*

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Federal Update
   • Dan Maldonado, Holland & Knight

B. State Update
   • Dale F. Shimasaki, Ph.D, Strategic Education Services

C. Legislative Update:
   • AB 19 (Santiago) The California Community College Promise
     o Patrick McCallum, McCallum Group, Inc.
   • SB 769 (Hill) Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program
     o Patrick McCallum, McCallum Group, Inc.
   • SB 628 (Lara) Governing Board Elections: Los Angeles Community College District
     o Paul Bauer, Mercury
   • Prop 98 Test 3B Suspension
     o Dale F. Shimasaki, Ph.D, Strategic Education Services
   • 2017-2018 Legislative Bill Matrix

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.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES
July 27-August 2, 2017

This report has been prepared for the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) by Holland & Knight LLP to provide a brief overview of federal legislative and regulatory activity for the period of July 27, – August 2, 2017.

Senator John McCain Casts Crucial Vote to Kill Obamacare Skinny Repeal

On Thursday, July 27th the Senate completed all debate time on the Better Care Reconciliation Act of 2017 (BCRA), the bill that would repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act (ACA). As was being publicly reported all day, the Majority Leader was working toward a “least common denominator” approach (the so-called “Skinny Bill”) that could allow the Senate to pass some form of legislation with the idea that it could then be further considered in a House-Senate conference. Late in the afternoon, four GOP Senators (Senators Johnson (WI), Graham (SC), Cassidy (LA) and McCain (AZ)) held a press conference to indicate that they would not vote for the Skinny Bill unless they received assurances from the Speaker of the House that he would take the bill to conference and not try to move it directly to the President. At around 9:00 p.m., the Speaker provided the requested assurance.

During the debate, a number of amendments were offered and voted upon. Behind the scenes, however, Majority Leader McConnell was working to develop a substitute proposal that could garner the support of 50 Republican Senators. About an hour later, the Majority Leader revealed the Skinny Bill which consisted of eight provisions: (1) repeal of the employer mandate (tax payment), (2) repeal of the individual mandate (tax penalty), (3) expansion of health savings accounts (HSAs), (4) a one year cut off of funding for Planned Parenthood, (5) repeal of the Public Health Prevention Fund, (6) additional funding for Community Health Centers, (7) a three year moratorium of the medical device tax, and (8) modifications to the “Section 1332 Waiver” requirements. Following additional debate and amendment consideration, the Senate put the Skinny Bill to a final vote at approximately 2:00 a.m. The vote failed 49-51. All members of the Democratic Caucus voted against the bill and were joined by three Republican Senators: Collins (ME), Murkowski (AK) and McCain (AZ). Senators Collins and Murkowski had opposed the initial vote to open debate whereas the vote against the bill by Senator McCain caught most observers as a surprise development.
Secretary DeVos Announces Plans to Overhaul Student Loan Customer Service

On August 1st, U.S. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos announced her intent to transform how Federal Student Aid (FSA) provides customer service to more than 42 million student loan borrowers.

“The FSA Student Loan Program represents the equivalent of being the largest special purpose consumer bank in the world,” said Dr. A. Wayne Johnson, the new Chief Operating Officer of Federal Student Aid (FSA). “To improve customer service, we will take the best ideas and capabilities available and put them to work for Americans with student loans. When FSA customers transition to the new processing and servicing environment in 2019, they will find a customer support system that is as capable as any in the private sector. The result will be a significantly better experience for students – our customers – and meaningful benefits for the American taxpayer.”

The anticipated FSA Next Generation Processing and Servicing Environment will provide for a single data processing platform to house all student loan information while at the same time allowing for customer account servicing to be performed either by a single contract servicer or by multiple contract servicers. This new approach is also expected to require separate acquisitions for database housing, system processing and customer account servicing which will allow for maximum flexibility today and into the future. FSA expects these contemplated changes to the servicing and processing environment to provide the opportunity for additional companies to submit proposals for contracting with FSA.

Secretary DeVos recognizes the opportunities Dr. Johnson has identified to enhance FSA’s Next Generation Processing and Servicing Environment and accordingly the Department has cancelled the current student loan solicitation (Solicitation #ED-FSA-17-R-001).

Contracts with current FSA student loan servicers expire in 2019. Dr. Johnson and his team will have the new processing and servicing environment in place prior to the expiration of the current contacts.

2017 Promise Neighborhoods Grant Competition Announced

On July 21, 2017, the U.S. Department of Education published in the Federal Register, a Notice Inviting Applications (NIA) for the Promise Neighborhoods program. The Promise Neighborhoods program, a signature Obama Administration initiative, is a competitive grant program that strives to significantly improve the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in distressed communities, and to transform those communities. The focus on this year’s competition has shifted from past competitions. This year, the Department is looking for applications with a focus on safety and law enforcement as opposed to earlier competitions that focused on early childhood development.

To date, the Department has invested over $370 million in the program which has reach 54 communities across the nation. Descriptions of previous awardees can be found at,
http://innovation.ed.gov/what-we-do/parental-options/promise-neighborhoods-pn/awards/. In FY17, the Department estimates making 5-7 awards (the Department is not bound by any estimates). Applications are due September 5, 2017 at 4:30:00 p.m. (Washington, D.C. time), and must be submitted through Grants.gov.
MEMORANDUM

August 17, 2017

TO: Members, Legislative and Public Affairs Committee

FM: Dale F. Shimasaki, Ph.D

RE: Legislative Update for August

**SB 54 [de Leon]**

Latest Version: As amended July 10, 2017
LACCD Position: Support
Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee

This bill prohibits state and local law enforcements (including school security) from doing any of the following:

(1) using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes that are specified in the bill, including entering into agreements authorized by federal law to delegate immigration powers to local police, and accepting designation as "immigration officers" pursuant to federal law;

(2) making agency or department databases, including databases maintained for the agency or department by private vendors, or the information therein other than information within those databases regarding an individual’s citizenship or immigration status, available to anyone or any entity for the purpose of immigration enforcement;

(3) placing peace officers under the supervision of federal agencies or employ peace officers deputized as special federal officers or special federal deputies;

(4) using federal immigration authorities as interpreters for law enforcement matters relating to individuals in agency or department custody; and

(5) transferring an individual to federal immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant or judicial probable cause determination.
On an interview with Meet the Press television show, Governor Brown supported the notion of preventing ‘abuse of federal power’ on immigration but expresses concerns with the bill. The Governor specifically said, people in the country illegally who have committed crimes "have no business in the United States," but said he wants to help others who have contributed to California.\(^1\)

Amendments are expected after discussions between the Governor, the Attorney General, and the author are concluded.

**Test 3B Cuts to Proposition 98**

As reported in previous correspondence, the Education Trailer bill to the budget contains language which allows the administration to cut the Proposition 98 guarantee by $850 million over the 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 years. Specifically, the Legislature adopted the deletion of trailer bill language which proposes to waive the Test 3B statute for funding Proposition 98.

The schedule of the cuts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension of Proposition 98 Test 3B(^2)</th>
<th>Reductions to K-14 Education (amounts in millions)</th>
<th>LACCD</th>
<th>LACCD per FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>-$450</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$42/FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>-$290</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$27/FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>-$110</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$10/FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total reduction</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$850</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79/FTES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This action arbitrarily pre-approves cuts to the K-14 education budget without justification that the cuts will be needed in future years.
- Cutting K-14 education, beyond the 2017-18 budget, occurs when there is no certainty that there will be a budget deficit or that revenues will be insufficient to fund the Proposition 98 guarantee.
- Arbitrarily waiving statue is not necessary. If cuts are required in the future, the Legislature can negotiate that waiver in the year they are negotiating the budget.
- Pre-approving cuts to Proposition 98 for future years, when other parts of the budget are protected from cuts, is inequitable. This is both premature and unnecessary since there is no basis for cutting only K-14 education for the future years.

Furthermore, cutting K-14 education funding in the future runs counter to the goals of Proposition 98, which was designed to guarantee a minimum level of funding to school districts and community colleges. The initiative intended to raise California to the top ten states in per-pupil funding; California is currently ranked 46th nationally in adjusted per-pupil expenditures. The state’s community college funding is similarly among the lowest in the country. A computer simulation of the cuts sorted by community college district is attached.


\(^2\) - Source: Legislative Analyst’s Office, Analysis of May Revision Education Proposals for 2017-18, pp 3
## Attachment A: Effect of Proposition 98 Test 3B Appropriation Suspension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>$ Loss 2018-19</th>
<th>$ Loss 2019-20</th>
<th>$ Loss 2020-21</th>
<th>Total $ Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Hancock CCD</td>
<td>$406,204</td>
<td>$261,776</td>
<td>$99,294</td>
<td>$767,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope CCD</td>
<td>$464,666</td>
<td>$299,452</td>
<td>$113,585</td>
<td>$877,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow CCD</td>
<td>$106,907</td>
<td>$68,896</td>
<td>$26,133</td>
<td>$201,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte CCD</td>
<td>$489,959</td>
<td>$315,751</td>
<td>$119,768</td>
<td>$925,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo CCD</td>
<td>$408,500</td>
<td>$263,256</td>
<td>$99,856</td>
<td>$771,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos CCD</td>
<td>$770,534</td>
<td>$496,566</td>
<td>$188,353</td>
<td>$1,455,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot-Las Positas CCD</td>
<td>$687,852</td>
<td>$443,282</td>
<td>$168,142</td>
<td>$1,299,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffey CCD</td>
<td>$659,120</td>
<td>$424,766</td>
<td>$161,118</td>
<td>$1,245,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus CCD</td>
<td>$526,999</td>
<td>$339,621</td>
<td>$128,822</td>
<td>$995,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast CCD</td>
<td>$1,588,342</td>
<td>$1,023,598</td>
<td>$388,261</td>
<td>$3,000,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton CCD</td>
<td>$207,167</td>
<td>$133,508</td>
<td>$50,641</td>
<td>$391,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa CCD</td>
<td>$1,279,727</td>
<td>$824,713</td>
<td>$312,822</td>
<td>$2,417,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain</td>
<td>$62,427</td>
<td>$40,231</td>
<td>$15,260</td>
<td>$117,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert CCD</td>
<td>$373,799</td>
<td>$240,893</td>
<td>$91,373</td>
<td>$706,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino CCD</td>
<td>$758,001</td>
<td>$488,490</td>
<td>$185,289</td>
<td>$1,431,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather River CCD</td>
<td>$74,886</td>
<td>$48,260</td>
<td>$18,306</td>
<td>$141,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill CCD</td>
<td>$1,374,511</td>
<td>$885,796</td>
<td>$335,991</td>
<td>$2,596,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan CCD</td>
<td>$230,799</td>
<td>$148,737</td>
<td>$56,417</td>
<td>$435,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale CCD</td>
<td>$619,116</td>
<td>$398,986</td>
<td>$151,339</td>
<td>$1,169,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont CCD</td>
<td>$713,696</td>
<td>$459,938</td>
<td>$174,459</td>
<td>$1,348,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell CCD</td>
<td>$314,633</td>
<td>$202,763</td>
<td>$76,910</td>
<td>$594,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial CCD</td>
<td>$298,714</td>
<td>$192,504</td>
<td>$73,019</td>
<td>$564,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern CCD</td>
<td>$842,639</td>
<td>$543,034</td>
<td>$205,978</td>
<td>$1,591,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe CCD</td>
<td>$121,901</td>
<td>$78,559</td>
<td>$29,798</td>
<td>$230,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen CCD</td>
<td>$76,876</td>
<td>$49,542</td>
<td>$18,792</td>
<td>$145,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach CCD</td>
<td>$840,792</td>
<td>$541,844</td>
<td>$205,527</td>
<td>$1,588,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles CCD</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,140,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,668,596</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,012,226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,821,746</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Rios CCD</td>
<td>$2,263,246</td>
<td>$1,458,536</td>
<td>$553,238</td>
<td>$4,275,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin CCD</td>
<td>$159,138</td>
<td>$102,556</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>$300,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino CCD</td>
<td>$129,942</td>
<td>$83,741</td>
<td>$31,764</td>
<td>$245,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced CCD</td>
<td>$414,011</td>
<td>$266,807</td>
<td>$101,203</td>
<td>$782,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiraCosta CCD</td>
<td>$503,198</td>
<td>$324,283</td>
<td>$123,004</td>
<td>$950,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey CCD</td>
<td>$270,251</td>
<td>$174,162</td>
<td>$66,061</td>
<td>$510,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Antonio CCD</td>
<td>$1,341,258</td>
<td>$864,366</td>
<td>$327,863</td>
<td>$2,533,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>FY 01-02</td>
<td>FY 02-03</td>
<td>FY 03-04</td>
<td>FY 04-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Jacinto CCD</td>
<td>$495,096</td>
<td>$319,062</td>
<td>$121,023</td>
<td>$935,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa CCD</td>
<td>$247,170</td>
<td>$159,287</td>
<td>$60,419</td>
<td>$466,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orange CCD</td>
<td>$1,706,523</td>
<td>$1,099,759</td>
<td>$417,150</td>
<td>$3,223,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone CCD</td>
<td>$375,474</td>
<td>$241,972</td>
<td>$91,783</td>
<td>$709,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde CCD</td>
<td>$78,689</td>
<td>$50,711</td>
<td>$19,235</td>
<td>$148,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar CCD</td>
<td>$790,322</td>
<td>$509,319</td>
<td>$193,190</td>
<td>$1,492,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena CCD</td>
<td>$1,060,365</td>
<td>$683,347</td>
<td>$259,200</td>
<td>$2,002,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta CCD</td>
<td>$900,244</td>
<td>$580,157</td>
<td>$220,060</td>
<td>$1,700,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santiago CCD</td>
<td>$1,363,106</td>
<td>$878,446</td>
<td>$333,204</td>
<td>$2,574,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwoods CCD</td>
<td>$167,038</td>
<td>$107,647</td>
<td>$40,832</td>
<td>$315,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo CCD</td>
<td>$531,904</td>
<td>$342,783</td>
<td>$130,021</td>
<td>$1,004,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside CCD</td>
<td>$1,208,304</td>
<td>$778,685</td>
<td>$295,363</td>
<td>$2,282,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino CCD</td>
<td>$610,683</td>
<td>$393,552</td>
<td>$149,278</td>
<td>$1,153,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego CCD</td>
<td>$1,803,633</td>
<td>$1,162,341</td>
<td>$440,888</td>
<td>$3,406,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CCD</td>
<td>$940,246</td>
<td>$605,936</td>
<td>$229,838</td>
<td>$1,776,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta CCD</td>
<td>$639,499</td>
<td>$412,121</td>
<td>$156,322</td>
<td>$1,207,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose CCD</td>
<td>$504,308</td>
<td>$324,999</td>
<td>$123,275</td>
<td>$952,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo CCD</td>
<td>$332,242</td>
<td>$214,111</td>
<td>$81,215</td>
<td>$627,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo CCD</td>
<td>$900,189</td>
<td>$580,122</td>
<td>$220,046</td>
<td>$1,700,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara CCD</td>
<td>$727,064</td>
<td>$468,552</td>
<td>$177,727</td>
<td>$1,373,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita CCD</td>
<td>$663,161</td>
<td>$427,371</td>
<td>$162,106</td>
<td>$1,252,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica CCD</td>
<td>$1,088,898</td>
<td>$701,734</td>
<td>$266,175</td>
<td>$2,056,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoias CCD</td>
<td>$393,289</td>
<td>$253,453</td>
<td>$96,137</td>
<td>$742,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta Tehama CCD</td>
<td>$287,127</td>
<td>$185,037</td>
<td>$70,187</td>
<td>$542,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra CCD</td>
<td>$609,868</td>
<td>$393,026</td>
<td>$149,079</td>
<td>$1,151,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou CCD</td>
<td>$125,829</td>
<td>$81,090</td>
<td>$30,758</td>
<td>$237,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano CCD</td>
<td>$322,153</td>
<td>$207,685</td>
<td>$78,748</td>
<td>$608,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma CCD</td>
<td>$832,160</td>
<td>$536,283</td>
<td>$203,417</td>
<td>$1,571,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County CCD</td>
<td>$1,097,352</td>
<td>$701,183</td>
<td>$268,242</td>
<td>$2,072,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern CCD</td>
<td>$617,182</td>
<td>$397,739</td>
<td>$150,867</td>
<td>$1,165,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Center CCD</td>
<td>$1,197,729</td>
<td>$771,870</td>
<td>$292,778</td>
<td>$2,262,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura CCD</td>
<td>$1,109,635</td>
<td>$715,098</td>
<td>$271,244</td>
<td>$2,095,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Valley CCD</td>
<td>$394,433</td>
<td>$254,190</td>
<td>$96,417</td>
<td>$745,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills CCD</td>
<td>$220,662</td>
<td>$142,204</td>
<td>$53,939</td>
<td>$416,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kern CCD</td>
<td>$109,473</td>
<td>$70,549</td>
<td>$26,760</td>
<td>$206,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley CCD</td>
<td>$590,660</td>
<td>$380,648</td>
<td>$144,384</td>
<td>$1,115,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite CCD</td>
<td>$606,738</td>
<td>$391,009</td>
<td>$148,314</td>
<td>$1,146,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba CCD</td>
<td>$330,814</td>
<td>$213,191</td>
<td>$80,866</td>
<td>$624,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Total</td>
<td>$49,500,000</td>
<td>$31,900,000</td>
<td>$12,100,000</td>
<td>$93,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los Angeles Community College District
Legislative Committee Report – 8/23/17

Legislative Update
The Legislature recessed for one month after their floor session on July 21st. They returned for one month of work on August 21st. All policy committee hearings have been concluded and the Legislature’s fiscal committees will meet for two weeks now that the Legislature has returned. Bills with a cost associated to them of greater than $150,000 will go to the Appropriations Committees’ suspense files and all be heard on one day, Friday, September 1st. After the Appropriations Committees have completed their work, the Legislature will go into floor session only for two weeks before the first year of the two-year session comes to a close.

In addition to our continued advocacy for 2017, we are beginning meetings and conversations with legislators, legislative staff, the State Chancellor’s Office and the administration about priorities for 2018.

Bills of Interest
AB 19 (Santiago) – this measure would waive enrollment fees for all first-time, full-time students, creating a California Community College Promise Program. The bill is sponsored by LACCD along with other large districts.

- The bill would enable local districts to create a state-local promise partnership whereby the state could take the fees “off the table” and districts could focus fundraising efforts on access costs for low income students.
- The cost of the bill was updated to approximately $34 million due to the initial estimate not including AB 540 students. If the bill were to start in January, the first-year cost would be half this.
- The bill was recently amended to include provisions requiring districts to undertake certain “promise program” initiatives in order to waive fees for the first-time, full-time students.
- The bill passed out of Senate Education Committee unanimously.
- The bill was heard in Senate Appropriations on Monday and went to the committee’s suspense file.
- The bill will be heard again on September 1st to determine if it gets out of the committee.
- We have met with the administration, the Senate leadership and the State Chancellor’s Office on the bill in hopes of moving it out of Senate Appropriations.

SB 769 (Hill) – this measure would extend the sunset date on the California Community College Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program.

- The bill was amended to remove provisions that would have expanded the pilot program by 10 new programs.
• The Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee did not want to expand the program prior to the LAO report on the current programs was released. That report is scheduled to be released later this year.
• The bill, in its amended form, passed out of Assembly Higher Education with only one “no” vote.
• The bill was heard in Assembly Appropriations this morning and placed in suspense. It will be heard on September 1st to determine whether or not it comes out of suspense and continues to move.

Other Bills of Interest
AB 343 (McCarty) – would exempt students who have a special immigrant visa or is a refugee from paying nonresident tuition.
  - In Senate Appropriations suspense file

AB 618 (Low) – would authorize a community college district that has a project labor agreement to utilize Job Order Contracting
  - On the Senate floor

AB 705 (Irwin) – would require community colleges to utilize high school transcripts and multiple measures when placing students
  - In the Senate Appropriations suspense file

AB 1665 (Garcia) – would extend that California Advanced Services Fund
  - In Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications

SB 68 (Lara) – would authorize a student to use community college work to count towards enrollment requirements to qualify as an AB 540 student
  - In Assembly Appropriations suspense file

SB 539 (de León) – would establish the California Community College Student Achievement Program
  - Language was incorporated in budget trailer bill and $25 million in funding was provided in the budget

SB 694 (Newman) – would require the community college Chancellor’s office to ensure that each campus provides for a dedicated Veterans’ Resource Center
  - Was not heard in Assembly Veterans’ Affairs as $10 million in funding was included in the budget for Veterans’ Resource Centers
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 the 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
AB 19 (Santiago)
The California Community College Promise

Appendix: Evidence Supporting AB 19 and similar Promise Programs

AB 19 creates the California Community College 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. By creating a college-going culture throughout the California, AB 19 will expand access to financial aid, promote equity, increase enrollment, help improve academic performance, and boost completion rates.

1. **AB 19 can expand access to financial aid and decrease student debt:**
   a. The measure provides tuition relief for first-time full-time students.
   b. Promoting full-time attendance can help CCC students access and identify state (BOG waiver, Cal Grant) and federal (Pell Grant) financial aid that many may not know they are eligible to receive.
      i. For example, Tennessee Promise students are required to file a federal financial aid application (FAFSA). Over 70% of high school seniors in Tennessee completed the FAFSA in 2015-16, the highest rate in the country. AB 19 can help motivate students, once at a CCC, to similarly apply for federal aid.
      ii. As another example, at Ventura College, the percentage of first-time students receiving BOG waivers steadily increased from 2006-14, and the college attributed this to its own Ventura College Promise. AB 19 can similarly help identify additional students eligible for a BOG waiver.

2. **AB 19 can promote equity:**
   a. The measure can help reach students who may not have otherwise entered college.
      i. 60% of Tennessee Promise recipients are first in their family to go to college and 70% are from low-income families.
      ii. A survey of Oregon Promise students found first-generation recipients were much more likely to report the Promise influenced them to attend college than non-first-generation recipients.
      iii. After a period of nine years, nearly half of all Ventura Promise students reported that they would not have attended college without the program.
   b. The Long Beach Promise has seen increases in the number and percentage of students across all ethnic groups who have successfully completed coursework needed to transfer to a 4-year program.
   c. Ventura College found that Latino students in the Promise cohort were awarded more degrees or certificates (21%) than Latino students in the non-Promise cohort (11%).
3. **AB 19 can increase enrollment:**

   a. Since the implementation of the Tennessee Promise in 2014, first-time freshman enrollment in public higher education has increased by 13 percent.\(^9\) In addition, the college-going rate in Tennessee rose by 4.6% in the inaugural year of the Promise, a larger percent than in the last 7 years combined.\(^10\)

   b. CSU Long Beach experienced a 43% increase in enrollment by Long Beach Unified students from 2008-12.\(^11\)

   c. In the first year of the Oregon Promise, there was a 25% increase in high school students enrolled at the state’s community colleges.\(^12\) As a specific example, enrollment at Chemeketa Community College in Salem jumped 22%.\(^13\)

   d. At Ventura College, a survey found 82% of Promise students were enrolled full time compared to 46% of the general student population.\(^14\)

   e. In Kalamazoo, Michigan, the Promise program increased the chances of starting college within six months of graduating high school by 14% for any college and 34% for baccalaureate programs.\(^15\)

4. **AB 19 can improve academic performance:**

   a. Long Beach Promise students who successfully completed transfer-level math and transfer-level English increased by 200% and 500%, respectively.\(^16\)

   b. In 2012, Long Beach CCD saw increases in intent to transfer by 275%.\(^17\)

   c. Upon transferring to CSU Long Beach, Long Beach Community College and Long Beach Unified Promise graduates are more likely to remain enrolled than other students.\(^18\)

5. **AB 19 can boost completion rates:**

   a. At Ventura College, from 2009-12, Promise students were awarded 58% more degrees and certificates than their non-Promise counterparts.\(^19\)

   b. At Ventura College, from 2009-12, persistence rates (Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall) of Promise students significantly exceeded those of non-Promise students.\(^20\) In Tennessee, about 63 percent of the first Promise cohort re-enrolled in college for a second year.\(^21\) There are similar findings in the Pittsburg Promise (PA).\(^22\)
c. AB 19 encourages full-time enrollment, which has been shown to facilitate degree completion and speed of completion.

   i. In a study of the 1.9 million students who began postsecondary study in 2006, of the students who attended exclusively full time, 76% completed a degree and 80% either completed or were still enrolled by 2012. Of those attending exclusively part time, 21% completed a degree and 32% either completed or were still enrolled six years later. The completion rate for those attending a mixture of full time and part time was in between, with 41% completing a degree and 68% either completing a degree or still enrolled.23

   ii. At Ventura College, from 2009-12, the number of units taken by Promise students was higher than non-Promise students,24 and in Kalamazoo (Michigan) the Promise program increased the cumulative number of college credits attempted by 15%.25 Increasing units can facilitate college completion, as data on college completions suggests that inadequately supported low-income students are not completing sufficient credit hours per term to finish degrees in two or four or even six years.26

6. AB 19 can positively impact the community:

   a. This bill can produce a college-going culture throughout the community.

   b. Promise programs can impact enrollment in K-12 schools. Between 2005-2014, enrollment in the Kalamazoo (Michigan) Public Schools grew 24%, while enrollment in private schools decreased.27

   c. Promise programs can impact completion at other local 4-year schools. Six-year graduation rates at CSU Long Beach have risen from 45% to 60%.28

   d. Promise programs can bring more attention to jobs that require an associate degree or technical certificate.

   e. Promise programs may increase economic productivity within the Promise region by keeping current residents in place and luring new residents to the area.

      i. The announcement of a Promise Program resulted in a 6-12% ($14,000-$20,500) increase in housing prices.29

      ii. Three years after the announcement of a Promise Program, overall population growth in Promise zones relative to surrounding cities was 2.7%, while population growth among families with children under 18 was 6.0%.30

      iii. Promise programs lead to a 1.7% increase in overall population of the local labor market.31
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IN BRIEF
Expands and modifies the existing SB 850 (Block, 2014) Community College Baccalaureate Degree pilot program:
- Extends the pilot program sunset five years from 2023 to 2028.

THE ISSUE
22 other states allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degree programs.

In California, only 375 students are currently enrolled in the first 10 community college baccalaureate programs around the state. When five more districts begin their programs this year that number will only increase to around 562 students.

The pilot program needs to be expanded so more community college students can have access to baccalaureate programs in their local communities.

36 community college districts applied for the 15 pilot program slots in 2014. There’s a clear need and desire for more districts and students to participate in an expanded pilot program.

In 2030, if current trends persist, 38 percent of jobs will require at least a bachelor’s degree. But population and education trends suggest that only 33 percent of working-age adults in California will have bachelor’s degrees by 2030—a shortfall of 1.1 million college graduates.

Community colleges account for more than half of undergraduate enrollment in California—open access, wide geographic distribution, and relatively low fees make them especially popular; however, only one in ten community college students transfer to a four-year university.

College completion rates have been improving, but not fast enough. And there will not be enough highly educated newcomers to California—from abroad or from other states—to close the skills gap.

Affordability
Students participating in the community college baccalaureate pilot program pay approximately $10,560 in fees and tuition for their four-year degree. On average, California State University in-state students will pay $27,036 for four years of study. Technical and trade schools average around $33,000. Private schools cost over $30,000 per year.

For example, at Foothill College, where the dental hygiene program is part of the SB 850 pilot, there were only four or five schools in California that offered the degree—all private—and the cost was $40,000 to $60,000 annually. Those are not realistic choices for the majority of community college students. Many community college students have jobs and families; they can't pack up and move and they aren't prepared to go into the kind of debt that would be necessary to enroll in more expensive institutions. Offering these career training courses in the community colleges is less costly for students and the state.

Access
Many Californians don’t live near a CSU or UC. Community colleges are the most accessible option for them. For the majority of the community college baccalaureate degree pilot programs, they are building on successful career technical training programs they’ve already operated for years. By offering degree programs linked with local industries and employers, students have access to good jobs in their community.

EXISTING PILOT PROGRAM
Of the students enrolled in 10 pilot programs statewide, 57 percent are from underserved ethnic groups and 72 percent are female. The other 5 colleges in the pilot program are currently recruiting students and expect to launch programs this fall.

Students participating in the baccalaureate pilot program pay approximately $10,560 in fees and tuition for their four-year degree, a fraction of the cost of private and other public universities. On average, California State University in-state students will pay $27,036 for four years of study. The average annual tuition for a private not-for-profit university is $36,000.

Colleges participating in the pilot program include:
1. Antelope Valley College - airframe manufacturing technology (Lackey, Wilk)
2. Bakersfield College - industrial automation (Fong, Fuller)
3. Cypress College - mortuary science (Quirk Silva, Newman)
4. Feather River College - equine industry (Dahle, Gaines)
5. Foothill College - dental hygiene (Berman, Hill)
6. Mesa College - health information management (Maienschein, Weber, Atkins)
7. Mira Costa College – biomanufacturing (Chavez, Bates)
8. Modesto Junior College - respiratory care (Gray, Galgiani)
9. Rio Hondo College - automotive technology (Calderon, Mendoza)
10. Santa Ana College - occupational studies (Daly, Nguyen)
11. Santa Monica College - interaction design (Bloom, Allen)
12. Shasta College - health information management (Dahle, Gaines)
13. Solano Community College - biotechnology (Frazier, Dodd)
14. Skyline College - respiratory care (Mullin, Hill)
15. West Los Angeles College - dental hygiene (Ridley Thomas, Mitchell)

There are a total of 206 students enrolled in 10 pilot programs, with data disaggregated as follows:

Female – 148
Male – 58
African American – 12
Asian – 81
Caucasian – 80
Hispanic – 50
Mixed – 12
Other – 11
Age 30 and under – 125
Age 31-50 – 66
Age 50 and over – 15

Colleges have been filing quarterly reports with the Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office with data that is required in the SB 850 bill language. These reports will be expanded to include more data points as the programs reach the one year mark, and as the new programs launch in 2017. Colleges are undergoing accreditation by the ACCJC, and curriculum approved through the CCCCO. The standards are very high to operate the programs.

PPIC STUDY JAN 2017
The Public Policy Institute of California released a report earlier this year (http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_117HJR.pdf) which found that, “only 33 percent of working-age adults in California will have bachelor’s degrees by 2030—a shortfall of 1.1 million college graduates.”

“Community colleges account for more than half of undergraduate enrollment in California—open access, wide geographic distribution, and relatively low fees make them especially popular.”

“Many students never transfer to four-year schools. Approximately one in ten community college students transfer to a four-year university.”

PILOT SUNSET IS A PROBLEM
The challenge with the sunset is that the colleges are working with local high schools, current and prospective students on recruiting efforts. Additionally, a large part of those efforts are focused on working with local industries to identify incumbent workers who can move into these programs. If the sunset remains, colleges will not be able to recruit past spring of 2018, (one year from now). Students who begin fall 2018 would graduate in Spring 2022. Measuring the success of the program would mean that only 2 full four year cohorts could move through the program, 2017-2021, 2018-2022. By the time the LAO report is released, the impact of the sunset would then be impacting the measures of success that were set out in the law. Students are unlikely to choose programs that have no guarantee of continuing, thus program viability would be in jeopardy.

BACKGROUND
On September 28, 2014, California Governor Jerry Brown signed SB 850 (Block) authorizing the Board of Governors of California's Community Colleges (BOG), in consultation with representatives of the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC), to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree pilot program at no more than 15 California Colleges. The Board of Governors was charged to develop a process for selection of the pilot programs.

SB 850 contained the following requirements:
Community College Districts were limited to one pilot program offering at one campus within the district.

Community College Districts couldn’t offer a baccalaureate program already offered by a UC or CSU.

Requires the LAO to conduct interim and final evaluations of the pilot program and report to the Legislature and the Governor. The interim evaluation is due July 1, 2018, and the final evaluation is due by July 1, 2022.

The pilot program sunsets on January 1, 2024.

SUPPORT

Association of California Community College Administrators
City of San Jose Fleet Manager
College of the Canyons
Community College League of CA
DeAnza Community College District
Del Grande Auto Dealer Group service department
Faculty of De Ana College
CA Farm Bureau Federation
Foothill De Anza College
John Bascom Auto
Kern Community College District
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Rios Community College District
Mesa Vista Hospital
North Orange County Community College District
Peralta Community College District
Redwoods Community College District
Rio Hondo College
San Diego Community College District
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Diego Unified School District
San Jose Evergreen Community College
Santa Monica College
Snap On Repair Systems
South Orange County Community College District
Synergenics
University of California San Francisco Chancellor’s Leadership Chair in Biochemistry – Science and Education
West Los Angeles College
Yuba Community College District

FOR MORE INFORMATION
Nate Solov – 651-4013 – nate.solov@sen.ca.gov
Los Angeles Community College District Elections
Senate Bill 628

Summary:
SB 628 will remove barriers that prohibit the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) from electing their Board of Trustees in a by-district method of election.

Background:
Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) serves the greater Los Angeles area and is the largest community college district in the United States and one of the largest in the world. It currently serves nine community colleges and over 135,000 students. LACCD is governed by a popularly elected seven-member Board. Board members are elected in an at-large system for terms of four years in alternate years.

Latinos alone make-up over 56% of the students served, along with 13.5% African Americans and 12.5% Asians. A little over half of the student population is under the poverty line. LACCD offers educational opportunities to students in 40 cities and communities covering an area of more than 882 square miles, including the entire city of Los Angeles, as well as other surrounding areas.

The California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) was enacted in 2001 to address racially polarized voting in at-large elections for local offices in California. In several jurisdictions throughout California, racially polarized voting dilutes the voting rights of minority communities because these communities are not able to elect candidates of choice and ensure fair representation. However, allowing a jurisdiction to have the option to switch to an election system that is divided into district areas and people vote in their district of residence. A district based election system gives minority communities the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice and have the power to influence local elections. District specific elections can ensure that the governing boards are representative of the ethnic and geographic diversities of populations they serve.

Other community college districts have faced CVRA legal challenges in recent years, including Compton Community College District, Cerritos Community College District, and Santa Clarita Community College District. All three districts have now adopted district based election systems.

Problem:
Under current law, LACCD is required to elect its Board of Trustees in an at-large system, which prevents them from switching to a district based method of election. Latinos constitute 36% of the citizen voting-age population of the LACCD, according to the 2010 U.S. Census. However, until March 2017, there was only one Latino currently serving on the seven-member board. Based on a review of election reports and demographic information, there is a lack of Latino representation on the board.

The current election system in LACCD has created the inability of minority voters to elect candidates of their choosing, thus the board is not reflective of the community it represents.

Underrepresented families and voters are denied an equal opportunity to elect representatives who make crucial decisions concerning the district. Under the current at-large election system, the Board is neither inclusive nor representative of all people served by this community college district. Governance of such critical higher education institutions should reflect the entire community they serve.

Solution:
SB 628 will allow the Los Angeles Community College District to switch from an at-large method of election to a district-based method. The trustee shall be required to reside and be registered to vote in the trustee area he or she seeks to represent.

With district based elections, LACCD will continue to build lasting partnerships with local businesses, institutions, community organizations and voters to provide the collaborative energy needed to truly meet the needs of the local population.

Contact:
Daisy Luna | Daisy.Luna@sen.ca.gov | (916) 651-4033
# 2017-18 LACCD Legislative Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill Overview</th>
<th>District Position</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Bills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 AB 19 (Santiago)</td>
<td>Waives enrollment fees for all first-time, full-time (12 units or more) students for one year</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>The district sponsored this bill in coordination with some of the other large community college districts throughout the state. Letters were sent to the committees prior to the bill being heard and testimony was provided at the committee hearings. Chancellor Rodriguez provided testimony in Assembly Higher Education and Vice Chancellor Miller provided testimony in Senate Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AB 343 (McCarty)</td>
<td>Exempts students who have been granted special immigrant visas pursuant to a specified federal statute, or are refugees admitted to the United States under a specified federal statute, from paying nonresident tuition at the California State University and the California Community colleges.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>Suspense File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 AB 387 (Thurmond)</td>
<td>Broadens definition of employer for the purposes of the minimum wage to include those engaged in supervised work experience to satisfy requirements for licensure, registration, or certification as an allied health professional.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td>Bill was amended to not apply to the educational institution at which a person is enrolled to fulfill the educational requirements for licensure, registration, or certification as an allied health professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AB 405 (Irwin)</td>
<td>Authorizes the board of governors, in consultation with the California State University and the University of California, to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree cybersecurity pilot program at not more than 10 community college districts</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2-Year Bill - held in Assembly Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 AB 559 (Santiago)</td>
<td>Requires the board of governors, by January 1, 2019, to ensure a fee waiver application is available to be completed and submitted electronically by students at each community college.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Held in Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td>Sent a letter of support to the Assembly Higher Education Committee and testified at the hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 AB 618 (Low)</td>
<td>Authorizes districts that have a PLA to utilize Job Order Contracting</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>Sent letters of support and testified in all of the committees that the bill was heard in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Support/Position</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 669 (Berman)</td>
<td>Bill no longer applies to community colleges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>SES sent letter of support when bill extended the sunset date of the CCC Economic and Workforce Development Program (EWDP) to July 2023. This language was included in the budget trailer bill and was no longer needed in this bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 705 (Irwin)</td>
<td>Requires community college districts to utilize high school transcripts and multiple measures for placing students into English and math</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>Sent letter of support to Senate Education Committee and testified in support of the measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 931 (McCarty)</td>
<td>Requires the target populations that the law authorizes the State Department of Health Care Services to contract with an outside agency to establish and implement a targeted public awareness and education campaign on suicide prevention to include community college, 4-year college, and university undergraduate and graduate students.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2-Year Bill - held in Senate Health Committee</td>
<td>$5 million in funding was included in the budget act for mental health services at community colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1037 (Limon)</td>
<td>Establishes, commencing with the 2018–19 academic year, the California Community Service Incentive Grant Program under the administration of the Student Aid Commission.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Held in Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td>Sent a letter of support to the Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1217</td>
<td>AB 1217 establishes in the Education Code a California State STEM School, a sixth-through-twelfth grade school in Los Angeles County that will be dedicated to preparing low income and underrepresented students for the pursuit of higher education degrees and workforce opportunities in STEM fields.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>Support: LA County Supervisors, CA Institute of Technology, CA Life Sciences Association, CA State Pipe Trades Council, LA Urban League, United Negro College Fund, Inc., UCLA, USC, and many others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1665 (Garcia)</td>
<td>Makes numerous changes to the California Advanced Services fund</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Energy, Utilities &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>Sent a letter of Support to the Senate Energy, Utilities and Commerce Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 54 (de Leon)</td>
<td>Prohibit law enforcement agencies, including school police, from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect of arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td>SES sent letter of support to Assembly Public Safety and Assembly Judiciary Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 68 (Lara)</td>
<td>Exempts a student, other than a nonimmigrant alien, from nonresident tuition at the California State University and the California Community Colleges if the student has a total of 3 or more years of attendance at California elementary schools, California secondary schools, campuses of the California Community Colleges, or a combination of those schools, and the student graduates from a California high school or attains the equivalent, attains an associate degree from a campus of the California Community Colleges, or fulfills minimum transfer requirements</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Suspense File</td>
<td>Sent letters of support to all of the appropriate committees, including the Assembly Higher Education Committee and Senate Education Committee and testified in those committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 539 (de Leon)</td>
<td>Establishes the Community College Student Achievement Program to encourage low income students to attend community college full-time</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Not heard in Assembly Higher Education</td>
<td>Language in the bill was adopted into the 2017-18 budget act and $25 million in funding was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 573 (Lara)</td>
<td>Authorizes the trustees, the board of governors, and the regents, to develop and ensure that each of their respective campuses implement a service learning program for students with financial need who are exempt from paying nonresident tuition under a certain provision of law.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 577 (Dodd)</td>
<td>Authorizes community college districts to offer a teacher credentialing program</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2-Year bill held in Assembly Higher Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 628 (Lara)</td>
<td>Current law requires the governing board of a school district or community college district that is situated wholly or partly within a city containing a population of over 1,900,000 according to the 1950 federal census to be composed of 7 members elected at large at the same time and manner of the city council of that city, as specified. This bill would delete this provision. The bill would also make changes in other code sections to conform to this deletion. This bill contains other related provisions and other current laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>8/21/17 File item #97 A-Third Reading File - Senate Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 694 (Newman)</td>
<td>Requires the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges to ensure that each of its campuses provides a dedicated on-campus Veteran Resource Center</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2-Year bill held in Assembly Veteran’s Affairs Committee</td>
<td>$10 million included in the budget to fund community college veteran’s resource centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Bill Number (Legislature)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status or Comment</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SB 769 (Hill)</td>
<td>Extends sunset date of community college baccalaureate degree pilot program</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SB 1379 (Mendoza)</td>
<td>Requires community college districts to provide rehire rights for part-time faculty</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Signed by the Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Federal Bills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>H.R. 244 (Frelinghuysen)</td>
<td>FY2017 Omnibus Appropriations Bill</td>
<td>Funds non-defense discretionary programs through Sept 20, 2017</td>
<td>Signed by the President in May, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H.R. 3218 (Roe)</td>
<td>The Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Bill</td>
<td>Provides Veterans a lifetime education benefit</td>
<td>Passed the House on July 24th, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>H.R. 3358 (Cole)</td>
<td>FY 2018 House</td>
<td>Funds discretionary program in Departments of Labor, Health &amp; Human Services, &amp; Related Agencies through Sept 30, 2018</td>
<td>Passed the House on July 20th, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>H.R. 2399 (Davis)</td>
<td>The Leveraging and Energizing America’s Apprenticeship Program (LEAP)</td>
<td>Provides $1500/$1000 tax credit to business with apprenticeship program</td>
<td>Introduced in House in May 2017; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Bill Number/Creator</td>
<td>Bill Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S. 128 (Graham)/H.R. 496 (Coffman)</td>
<td>The BRIDGE Act</td>
<td>Prevents students enrolled in the DACA program from being deported</td>
<td>Introduced in the Senate and House in January 2017; referred to the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and Senate Judiciary Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>H.R. 2451 (Davis)</td>
<td>Pell Grant Preservation and Expansion Act</td>
<td>Improves the purchasing power of the Pell Grant; permanently increase the maximum grant for inflation; shift the grant to mandatory funding</td>
<td>Introduced in the House in May 2017; referred to the Committee on Education &amp; Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S. 1362 (Isakson)</td>
<td>The Harry E. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act</td>
<td>Provides Veterans a lifetime education benefit</td>
<td>Passed Senate Veterans Affairs Committee on July 26th, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S. 806 (Sanders)</td>
<td>The College for All Act</td>
<td>Provides for free public college for students whose family income is $125,000 or below</td>
<td>Introduced in Senate in January; referred to Committee on Health Education Labor and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S. 628 (Kaine)</td>
<td>The Educating Tomorrow's Workforce Act</td>
<td>Amends the Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education Act to ensure programs are more career focused and meet the needs of employers</td>
<td>Introduced in the Senate in March of 2017 and referred to the Committee on Health Education Labor and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S. 206 (Portman-Kaine)</td>
<td>Expands Pell eligibility to cover high-quality and rigorous short-term job training programs</td>
<td>Introduced in January 2017 and referred to the Committee on Health Education Labor and Pensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S. 1352 (Cantwell) Apprenticeship and Job Training Act of 2017</td>
<td>Provides $5000 tax credit to employers who implement/expand apprenticeship programs</td>
<td>Introduced in Senate June 2017; referred to Committee on Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>DREAM Act (Graham-Durbin)</td>
<td>Bill will allow undocumented students who were brought to the U.S. as children to earn citizenship</td>
<td>Introduced in Senate July 19, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S. 1136 (Hirono) Pell Grant Preservation and Expansion Act</td>
<td>Improves the purchasing power of the Pell Grant; permanently increase the maximum grant for inflation; shift the grant to mandatory funding.</td>
<td>Improves the purchasing power of the Pell Grant; permanently increase the maximum grant for inflation; shift the grant to mandatory funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>