Access, Equity & Success for All

Recommendations
CEO Funding Formula Workgroup
“The existing enrollment-based CCC apportionment funding model does not appropriately reflect the Board of Governor's Vision for Success or the state’s priorities to better serve students and eliminate equity gaps. By funding colleges based primarily on enrollment, the current funding formula encourages districts to strictly prioritize student access without regard for student success—such as timely completion and better serving underrepresented students.”
### Summary of Governor’s Proposed Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Supplemental Grant</th>
<th>Success Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent on FTES enrollment comprising 50% of the formula</td>
<td>25% - Based on the number of low-income students districts enroll reflecting two factors:</td>
<td>Student Success Incentive Grants comprise 25% of total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) enrollment of students who receive a College Promise Grant fee waiver; and</td>
<td>1) Number of degrees and certificates granted;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) enrollment of students receiving a Pell Grant.</td>
<td>2) Number of students who complete a degree/certificate in three years or less;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Associate Degree for Transfer granted by the college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Governor’s Proposed Formula

Additional Provisions

- Hold harmless provision (17/18 funding level)
- Elimination of Summer shift
- Require each college to incorporate the goals of the Vision for Success within each college’s educational master plan and aligning budget with that plan
- Consolidate categorical programs to improve the incentives for districts to focus on student success while providing local flexibility
- Effective for the 2018/19 fiscal year
Board of Governors seeks alignment with the aspirational goals in the *Vision for Success*.

- In late January, Chancellor Oakley requested the CEOCCC convene a small group of CEOs to make recommendations for a new formula by April.

- This presentation outlines the conceptual framework of the recommendation for a new funding formula.
Members of the CEO Workgroup

- Sandra Caldwell, Reedley College
- Sunny Cooke, Mira Costa College
- Keith Curry, Compton College
- Willy Duncan, Sierra College
- Ron Galatolo, San Mateo CCD
- Brian King, Los Rios CCD
- Cheryl Marshall, North Orange CCD
- Marvin Martinez, East Los Angeles College
- Cindy Miles, Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
- Joe Wyse, Shasta College

- Staff Contacts:
  - Larry Galizio, Community College League of California
  - Lizette Navarette, Community College League of California
An Effective Funding Model will Meet the Following Principles

- Recognize the necessity of building institutional capacity to improve student outcomes by increasing community college base funding prior to implementation of a new funding formula;
- Integrate the enrollment and academic progress of economically disadvantaged populations with a formula that balances access, equity, and success for all students;
- Provide two years of program transition funding at a new, higher base level while the formula’s metrics are analyzed and refined to ensure their efficacy in advancing student equity, inclusion, and success;
- Adequately define equity metrics to most accurately represent all economically disadvantaged students (e.g. low income, CalWORKs, students with disabilities, foster youth, AB 540) and to identify their respective needs for Guided Pathways;
- Enhance funding predictability with a three-year average for base funding and by assigning Summer FTE to the fiscal year in which instruction was held;
- Progressively phase out transition funding to fully implement access, equity, and success metrics by 2025;
- Recognize the diversity of regional and local factors;
- Establish a funding formula oversight council to conduct annual analyses and to make recommendations for adjustments that advance equity-minded student success through improved fiscal stewardship.
Properly structured and adequately funded, a new funding model has the potential to move to a more accountable and stable system, ensuring that students have access to affordable, high-quality community colleges.
Data-Informed and Equity Focused

- Establish a process for an annual review and analysis of the funding formula.
- Annual reports to the Board of Governors by March of each year.
- Set a plan in place for an equity focused funding model while enabling necessary adjustments to meet key principles.
Building Capacity for Access, Equity, and Success for All

- Recognize the necessity of building capacity for quality educational opportunities
- Provide an across-the-system base allocation increase to assist institutions in building capacity and meeting growing fixed costs
- Consists of two years during which institutions would receive no less than their 2017-18 apportionment in concert with new, higher base rate
- Community college base funding would increase before implementation of a new funding formula
Access, Equity, and Success for All

Access
A funding formula that supports access but shifts away from an over-reliance on growth.

Equity
Adequately define equity to accurately represent all economically disadvantaged students (e.g. low income, CalWORKs, students with disabilities, foster youth, AB 540)

Success for All
Districts are recognized for the successful outcomes of economically disadvantaged students.
75% Access

- Continue to provide basic allocation, base FTES revenue and growth adjusted by the annual COLA
- Access funding based on a three-year average FTES
- A three-year average supports planning for new, and continuation of, highly effective programs
25% Equity & Success for All

Achieving equitable outcomes for focus populations means integrating socioeconomic and success metrics.

Framework:
- Recognizes successful outcomes of economically disadvantaged students within those metrics
- Considers progress, completion, transfer, and earnings
- Builds on Strong Workforce 17% incentive funding research and Guided Pathways key performance indicators (KPIs).

Equity
- Accurately define economically disadvantaged
- Build on Perkins definition

Success for All
- Measure All Transfers
- Economic Mobility
- Momentum Points
Thoughtful & Phased

Implemented in year three after extensive research and simulations of metrics to ensure their effectiveness in advancing student access, equity, and success.

**Transition:**

- Provide Program Transition funding at a higher base level while metrics are refined to ensure their effectiveness in advancing student equity, inclusion, and success.

- Step down Program Transition funding by 5% each year until 2024.

- At full implementation, over $2 billion would be dedicated to Success for All metrics.
Implementation Timeline

2 Year Program Transition

- No districts would receive less funding than prior fiscal year, plus COLA.
- Metrics analysis period to mitigate unintended negative effects on colleges and the communities they serve.
- Districts allotted time to implement Guided Pathways, AB 705, etc.

5 Year Program Transition

Step Down

- Implementation begins in Year 3.
- Success for All metrics would increase by 5% each year until full implementation.
- Equity defined to accurately capture all students served
- Access funded based on a three-year FTES average.
Categorical Program Structure

The Student **Equity & Success** Program

- Workgroups recommend integration of Student Success and Support Services, Basic Skills, and Student Equity
- Create a restricted categorical known as the Student Equity & Success program
- Continued commitment to equity-minded, student-centered services and supports
- Enables alignment of reporting metrics and maximizes services to students
Future Post Implementation Evaluation & Analysis

Regulations

● A comprehensive review of the new Equity-Focused Funding Formula necessitates an analysis that includes the impact of regulations such as the FON and 50 percent law.
● Final adjustments of Success for All metrics
● Impact on noncredit programs (non-CDCP)
● Evaluation of a census date for enrollment in noncredit programs
● Reporting alignment within other categorical programs not identified in this recommendation
● Programs addressing the needs of older students (25 years and older)
● District basic allocations to better reflect fixed operating costs associated with serving students
A significant and historical funding formula change to the nation’s largest system of higher education serving California’s most underserved and vulnerable populations, must include five essential elements:

- An appreciable base increase prior to implementation of a new funding formula recognizing the necessity to build institutional capacity to improve student outcomes;

- Two years of program transition funding at a new, higher base level with the statutory COLA while the formula’s metrics are analyzed and refined to ensure their efficacy in advancing student access, equity, and success;

- A three-year average for enrollment to enhance predictability and to mitigate volatility;

- A five-year progressive increase to full Equity & Success funding to allow for a complete cycle of Guided Pathways indicators to be measured; and

- An oversight council to conduct annual reviews and make recommendations to the Board of Governors to safeguard the long-term integrity of the formula in advancing equity-minded success for all.
Next Steps

✓ The Funding Formula Workgroups report must be submitted to the Chancellor by April 16
✓ Assembly and Senate Budget meetings on 4/18 and 4/19, respectively
✓ Governor’s May Revise on May 15
✓ Department of Finance agreed to provide multi-year simulations to Funding Formula Workgroup
✓ Assembly and Senate hold final hearings and votes May 21-June 1 (final dates TBD)
✓ Legislature must approve 2018-19 Budget Act by June 15
Thank you!

For progress on the recommendations, visit:
www.ccleague.org/fundingformula
Presenters

McCallum Group, Inc.

Patrick McCallum & Mark MacDonal
Proposed Funding Formula
Funding Formula

• Two Workgroups – CEO & CBO Workgroups
  – CEO Workgroup Principles
    1. Increase base funding prior to implementation of a new formula;
    2. Integrate enrollment and academic progress of disadvantaged populations with formula that balances access, equity, and success for all students;
    3. Provide two years of program transition funding at new, higher base level;
Funding Formula (Cont.)

– CEO Workgroup Principles (Cont.)
  4. Define equity metrics to most accurately represent all economically disadvantaged students;
  5. Three-year average for base funding and assign FTE to the fiscal year in which the instruction was held;
  6. Phase out transition funding by 2025;
  7. Recognize regional and local factors;
  8. Establish an oversight council to conduct annual analyses and to make recommendations
Funding Formula (Cont.)

• Other Major Issues Being Discussed
  1. Include growth in the budget request ensuring that all students are funded;
  2. Reexamination of the current growth funding formula;
  3. Changing certain noncredit CDCP courses from positive attendance to census date;
Categorical Programs

Basic Skills

SSSP

Equity

Single Categorical
Categorical Programs (Cont.)

- Would have to eliminate match on SSSP.

- Discussion of Categorical program being the student success pot of funding.
Where is the Legislature?
115th Online College
Online College

- $20 million ongoing $100 million one-time
- Focus on short-term sub-credentials
- Upgrade skills for those in the workforce, but with less than College degree

- Can the same goal be achieved through current infrastructure?
- Will there be duplication of programs?
- This is Governor’s top priority for CCCs
Where is the Legislature?
Student Financial Aid
Student Financial Aid

• Century Foundation Report
  – Streamline Cal Grant Delivery
  – Create a more equitable Cal Grant
  – Create Expected Family Contribution model
Phase 1
2018-19

Student Financial Aid

- Increase Cal Grant B Access Award
- Increase Commission Outreach
- Innovation Fund for financial aid
Phase 2
2018 (or 2019)

Cal Grant Consolidation

June 2018 Recommendations

Comprehensive Approach

McCallum Group, Inc.
Phase 3
2019-20

- Remake California Financial Aid to move to an EFC model
- Staff present proposal to full commission
Implementation of AB 19
College Promise – AB 19

✓ Administration Proposed $46 million for implementation of AB 19 (Santiago)

✓ Both Houses supportive of the proposal

✓ State Chancellor’s Office developing allocation formula
Funding Allocation

- State Chancellor developing allocation model
- Funding will be allocated so that all districts can implement first-time, full-time promise
May Revise
✓ LAO estimating that additional funding will become available at the May Revise.

✓ Most of the funding will not go to Proposition 98.

✓ This may be the year to get more funding into Cal Grants that are funded outside of Proposition 98.
Questions?

McCallum Group, Inc.
April 2018 Legislative Update

LEGISLATIVE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

PREPARED BY STRATEGIC EDUCATION SERVICES

APRIL 18, 2018
Background

Legislature: bills in policy committee
Governor: budget bill hearings and May Revision
Budget: $2.58 billion above forecast
Legislative Calendar-Upcoming Deadlines

April 27: Last day for policy committees to hear and report to fiscal committees fiscal bills introduced in their house.

May 11: Last day for policy committees to hear and report to the floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house.

June 15: Budget bill must be passed by midnight.
# LACCD Sponsored Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 2306</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Cal Grant eligibility from 4 to 6 years</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; to be heard in Appropriations on April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2575</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Dual enrollment for private school students</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3101</td>
<td>Carrillo</td>
<td>Revise CCC Apply by July 31, 2019</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 1406 [Hill] Update

Baccalaureate degree pilot program
Extends sunset date by two years to July 1, 2023
LACCD in support
Passed Senate Education Committee 6-0
In Senate Appropriations Committee; To be heard in Appropriations on April 23
Competing Tutoring Bills

AB 1935 [Irwin]: provide that supervised tutoring for basic skills eligible for state apportionment funding. Passed Higher Education; in Appropriations.

SB 1009 [Wilk]: provide that supervised tutoring for courses and classes in all subject areas be eligible for state apportionment funding. Passed Education; in Appropriations.
Other Bills of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1037</td>
<td>Limon</td>
<td>Cal Grant B Service Incentive Grant</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1858</td>
<td>Calderon</td>
<td>Financial Aid Shopping sheet</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; on Suspense file in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2477</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
<td>Dream Resource Liaisons</td>
<td>passed Higher Education; to be heard in Appropriations on April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1471</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Increase number of Cal Grant awards</td>
<td>Appropriations Suspense file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Immigration Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 2210</td>
<td>McCarty</td>
<td>Clean up bill to AB 343-McCarty of 2017 which exempts a student who is a refugee or a special immigrant visa [SIV] holder from Iraq and Afghanistan from paying nonresident tuition in a CA community college.</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; to be heard In Appropriations on April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2477</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
<td>Dream Resource Liaisons</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; to be heard in Appropriations on April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3008</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Provides exemptions from nonresident tuition to nonimmigrant noncitizen student who is the dependent of someone with an E-2 nonimmigrant classification and meets the same CA HS requirements as an undocumented student grants nonresident tuition exemption pursuant to AB 540</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1219</td>
<td>Gaines</td>
<td>Repeals CA Values Act [SB 54-De Leon of 2017]</td>
<td>Hearing canceled at request of author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnic Legislative Caucus Priorities: Education Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Caucus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2635</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>LCFF: supplemental grants: lowest performing pupil subgroup[s]</td>
<td>Passed Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>API Caucus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1248</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Right to wear cultural adornments at Graduation Ceremonies</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2291</td>
<td>Chiu</td>
<td>School safety: bullying</td>
<td>Passed Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2808</td>
<td>Muratsuchi</td>
<td>Increase LCFF funding formula targets by 60%</td>
<td>Passed Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino Caucus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1037</td>
<td>Limon</td>
<td>Dreamer Service Incentive Grant Program</td>
<td>Senate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2477</td>
<td>Rubio/Low</td>
<td>Dream Resource Liaisons</td>
<td>Passed Higher Education; in Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2772</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Passed Education; to be heard in Appropriations on April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 3022</td>
<td>Gonzalez/Fletcher</td>
<td>Retroactive High School Diplomas for Deported Pupils</td>
<td>Assembly Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/18/2018
AB 2306 (Santiago)  
Student Financial Aid: Cal Grant Program

Bill Summary
This bill would increase the total Cal Grant eligibility for a full-time California Community College (CCC) applicant to a 6-year period, if the applicant transfers from a community college to a 4-year qualifying institution.

Existing Law
Existing law establishes the Cal Grant Program under the administration of the Student Aid Commission. It also establishes eligibility requirements for awards under these programs for participating students attending qualifying institutions. Further, under current law, the program prohibits an applicant from receiving one or a combination of program awards in excess of the amount equivalent to the award level for a total of 4 year period of full-time attendance in an undergraduate program. EDC § 69433.5.

Background
With more than 2.1 million students on 114 campuses, the California Community Colleges is the largest system of higher education in the United States. On average, a community college student completes their program in a little more than 4 years while the financial aid received at the community college level is significantly lower than at a CSU or UC.

California students have a 6 year maximum eligibility in the Federal Pell grant program and a 4 year maximum eligibility in the state’s Cal Grant program. As a result, even though community college students might desperately need the financial aid, they do not apply for and use the Cal Grant in order to preserve financial aid eligibility at the higher cost four-year universities. The limit of four-year eligibility creates a financial for community college students and prolongs their educational careers as they choose to “save” their Cal Grant for the four-year university or college they eventually transfer to.

Of the three financial aid programs focused on low income students, the Cal Grant is used the least by community college students. While nearly a million students use the California Promise Grant (formerly the BOG Fee Waiver), less than half a million receive and use the Pell Grant and only slightly more than a hundred thousand use the Cal Grant each year. Underuse of these financial aid services lead financially disadvantaged students to forgo needs, increase workload or reduce course load in order to compensate.

Need for AB 2306
One in every five community college students in the nation attends a California community college. Three out of every 10 Californians ages 18-24 are currently enrolled in a community college. Over 67 percent of California community college students are people of diverse ethnic backgrounds and roughly 53 percent are female.

Currently students have a 4 year maximum eligibility in the state’s Cal Grant program. AB 2306 is designed to align the Cal Grant Program with the Pell Grant Program by extending maximum Cal Grant eligibility to 6 years for community college students intending to transfer to a 4 year institution. This proposal would enable students to receive Cal Grants while completing their studies at a community college and still have remaining Cal Grant eligibility at the university, relieving them of the burden of having to work extraneous hours while attending school.

Support
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)  
California Student Aid Commission  
San Jose Evergreen Community College District  
North Orange Community College  
De Anza Community College District  
Kern Community College District  
Los Rios Community College District  
Peralta Community College District
San Diego Community College District
San Francisco Community College District
South Orange County Community College District
Yuba Community College District

**Opposition**

None on File.

**For More Information**

Gabriela Castillo
Assemblymember Miguel Santiago AD53
916-319-2053 – Gabriela.Castillo@asm.ca.gov
Date of Hearing: April 3, 2018

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Jose Medina, Chair
AB 2306 (Santiago) – As Introduced February 13, 2018

SUBJECT: Student financial aid: Cal Grant Program

SUMMARY: Stipulates that a California Community College (CCC) applicant, or a former community college student who transfers to a four-year institution after having received a Cal Grant award while enrolled at a community college, and who meets all other Cal Grant eligibility criteria, shall be eligible to receive the Cal Grant award in the amount equivalent to six years of full-time attendance, instead of only four years of full-time attendance, in an undergraduate program, and makes conforming changes.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Establishes the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) for the purpose of administering specified student financial aid programs. (Education Code (EC) Section 69510, et seq.)

2) Establishes the Cal Grant A and B Entitlement Programs, the California Community College (CCC) Transfer Cal Grant Program, the Competitive Cal Grant A and B Programs, the Cal Grant C Program, and the Cal Grant T Program, each with specified eligibility requirements related to the applicant's age, academic achievement, family income, maximum award amount limits, length of award eligibility, and other factors. (EC Sect. 69430, et seq.)

3) Cal Grant B Awards. Students that meet income and asset thresholds and other eligibility requirements, have at least a 2.0 GPA are entitled to a living allowance and tuition and fee assistance. Awards for most first-year students are limited to an allowance for non-tuition costs (access award), such as books and living expenses (currently $1,672). In the second and subsequent years, the award also provides tuition and fee support. (EC Sect. 69435.)

4) Provides for a waiver of CCC enrollment fees – the California College Promise Grant (formerly Board of Governors (BOG) fee waiver) – for certain types of students, including those with household incomes below certain thresholds established by the BOG or with demonstrated financial need, pursuant to federal law. (EC Sect. 66025.3.)

5) CCC Full-Time Student Success Grant. Provides up to $1,000 annually to supplement the Cal Grant B or C access award for recipients who enroll in 12 or more credit units per semester. (Budget Act of 2015 and thereafter.)

6) CCC Completion Grant. Provides up to $2,000 annually to supplement the access award and the Full-Time Student Success Grant for Cal Grant B or C recipients who develop a comprehensive education plan and enroll in 15 or more units per semester. (EC Sect. 88910, et seq.)

7) Defines "part-time" enrollment, for purposes of eligibility for a partial Cal Grant award, as taking 6 to 11 semester units, inclusive, or the equivalent. (EC Sect. 69432.7(f) ((1))
8) Defines "full-time" enrollment, for purposes of eligibility for a full Cal Grant award, as taking 12 or more semester units or the equivalent. (EC Sect. 69432.7(f) (2))

9) Prohibits receipt of a Cal Grant award in excess of the amount equivalent to the award level for four years of full-time attendance in an undergraduate program. (EC Sect. 69433.5 (d) (1))

10) Stipulates that, an individual selected for a Cal Grant A award who enrolls in a CCC may elect to have the award held in reserve for up to two academic years, except that the CSAC may extend this to three academic years if the commission determines that the rate of academic progress has been as rapid as could be expected for the personal and financial conditions that the student has encountered. (EC Sect. 69434.5)

11) Under the CCC Transfer Cal Grant Entitlement Program, a student age 27 or less who was not awarded a Cal Grant A or B award at the time of his or her high school graduation but, at the time of transfer from a CCC to a qualifying baccalaureate program, or upon matriculation into the upper division coursework of a community college baccalaureate program, and who meets all other eligibility criteria, shall be entitled to a Cal Grant A or B award. (EC Sect. 69436)

12) The federal Pell Grant provides aid to students who demonstrate financial need, and can be used for tuition and fees, books and supplies, transportation, and living expenses for the equivalent of up to six years of full-time enrollment. The maximum Pell Grant for 2017-18 is $5,920. (20 U.S. Code Sect. 1070.)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown, but likely very significant.

COMMENTS: Background and Purpose. In general, community college students take four years or more to transfer to a four-year institution, and upon transfer, most take another three to four years to graduate. (It should be noted that, in many cases, this extended time to earn a degree is due to many students' need for remedial education prior to commencing on a degree path, their inability to gain timely access to oversubscribed courses required for transfer, and to part-time enrollment.) Because Cal Grant eligibility extends to the equivalent of only four years of full-time enrollment, many community college students do not apply for a Cal Grant in order to preserve their financial aid eligibility at four-year schools, where tuition costs are higher and fully covered by the Cal Grant (in the case of the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU)). (In general, CCC students who are Cal Grant-eligible already receive a waiver of CCC per-credit fees via the California College Promise Grant (formerly the BOG fee waiver).

According to the author, the four-year limit on Cal Grant eligibility creates a barrier to the use of the Cal Grants that disadvantages community college students and prolongs their educational careers as they choose to “save” the Cal Grant for the university. The author describes the scope of this issue by comparing the relative use of three financial aid programs focused on low-income students. While nearly one million of the 2.4 million CCC students use the California Promise Grant, less than half a million receive a federal Pell Grant and only slightly more than 100,000 receive a Cal Grant award each year. This underutilization of the latter programs probably leads many financially disadvantaged community college students to increase their work hours and/or reduce their course loads.
To address the above issue, AB 2306 would extend Cal Grant eligibility for community college students to the equivalent of six years of full-time enrollment, thus aligning with the six-year eligibility period for the Pell Grant program. The author believes this will enable more community college students to receive a Cal Grant while completing their CCC studies and still have sufficient remaining Cal Grant eligibility at a four-year school.

What is the Current Situation? To examine the extent to which current CCC students use their Cal Grant awards, CSAC provided data on both currently-enrolled CCC students and former students who have transferred and have received a renewal Cal Grant award for the 2017-18 academic year. Of the 80,000 CCC students, about one-fourth will have used more than two years of their Cal Grant eligibility at the CCC, as of the end of this academic year, and about 4% have used more than three years of their eligibility so far while at the CCC. It is unknown how much longer each of these students will remain at the CCC prior to their transfer, but these 25,000 students will have used at least more than half of their Cal Grant eligibility prior to transferring to a four-year school. It is thus likely that their Cal Grant eligibility will be fully expended prior to their graduation. Since this data is just a snapshot, it is also unknown how much more of their Cal Grant eligibility the other 55,000 CCC students – who have thus far used less than two years of eligibility – will exhaust prior to transferring.

Data reviewed on transferred CCC students was limited. However, data from UC indicates that, of 1,500 new transfer enrollees in 2013-14 who received a Cal Grant award while enrolled at the CCC, one-third lost their Cal Grant eligibility within the first two years after transfer and another one-quarter lost their eligibility in the third year after transfer.

The discussion above covers only Cal Grant award recipients. It does not account for those CCC students who are deemed eligible for a Cal Grant but elect to delay getting an award in order to preserve their eligibility until they transfer in order to ensure that they will maintain eligibility through to graduation at a four-year school. Nor does the data account for likely eligible students who do not even apply for a Cal Grant.

Based on the data above and the large disparity between the usage of Cal Grants vs. Pell Grants at the CCC, it is likely that extending Cal Grant eligibility to six years would result in (1) more Cal Grant awardees actually utilizing more of their eligibility while at the CCC and (2) more otherwise eligible CCC students likely taking advantage of the Cal Grant program while attending a community college.

On the Other Hand. In recent years, the CCC has been implementing several initiatives to increase the likelihood of student success, including reducing the time required for students to achieve their educational goals. These efforts include: transformation of remedial education, enhanced assessment, orientation, and educational planning support, the development of associate degrees for transfer to CSU, and the use of guided pathways.

In addition, the state has provided additional funding to incentivize more intensive course-taking by Cal Grant recipients at the CCC. Specifically, students taking at least 12 units per semester receive a Full-Time Student Success Grant, which in the current year provides up to $500 per semester to supplement the Cal Grant B access award. Moreover, the CCC Completion Grant provides up to $1,000 per semester to supplement the access award and the Full-Time Student Success Grant for Cal Grant B recipients who develop a comprehensive educational plan and enroll in 15 or more units per semester. Thus a Cal Grant B student taking 30 units in an
academic year can receive almost $4,700 in direct aid from the state to cover education expenses, in addition to receiving a fee waiver.

One must ask whether extending Cal Grant eligibility by two years as proposed by AB 2306 will provide a countervailing incentive for CCC transfer students to take fewer units and thus lengthen their time to transfer. For some students, this will probably be the case. The more desirable outcome with this bill, however, is that more CCC students will apply for, accept, and use their Cal Grant awards, reduce their work hours, increase their course loads – and in doing so take advantage of the additional, incentive grants – and thus transfer more quickly.

Related Legislation. AB 2248 (McCarty), also on today's committee agenda, redefines full-time enrollment, for purposes of determining Cal Grant eligibility, as taking at least 30 units per academic year. Cal Grant recipients would not be subject to the 30-unit requirement while attending a community college.

AB 3153 (Levine), pending in this committee, intends to allow Cal Grant recipients to receive additional Cal Grant awards for the equivalent of two summer sessions or terms of full-time attendance.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support
Alliance for Children's Rights
California Student Aid Commission
Community College League of California
Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
Foothill-De Anza Community College District
Kern Community College District
Los Rios Community College District
North Orange Community College District
Peralta Community College District
San Diego Community College District
San Francisco Community College District
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District
South Orange County Community College District
Yuba Community College District

Opposition
None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Chuck Nicol / HIGHER ED. / (916) 319-3960
AB 2575 (Santiago)
Dual Enrollment for All

Bill Summary
AB 2575 allows private schools to enter into a College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnership agreement with a community college district.

Existing Law
State law authorizes the governing board of a community college district to enter into a CCAP partnership with the governing board of a school district that governs traditional public schools (EDC § 76004).

Background
Signed into law in 2016, AB 288 (Holden and Olson) authorized a community college district to enter into a CCAP partnership with a school district for the purpose of developing seamless pathways from high school to community colleges in order to offer or expand dual enrollment opportunities for students who may not be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education.

Dual enrollment provides students the opportunity to take college courses and earn college credit while still in high school. Other programs, such as middle college high schools and early college high schools, use dual enrollment to offer instructional activities for at-risk students that focus on college preparatory curricula. Overall, CCAP partnerships improve high school graduation rates and overall student educational and career readiness.

Need for AB 2575
Unfortunately, current state law does not allow community colleges to enter into a CCAP with private schools, including parochial schools, therefore excluding hundreds of students from the benefits that come with CCAP partnerships.

By authorizing community college districts to enter into a CCAP partnership agreement with private schools, AB 2575 will expand dual enrollment opportunities for all students and thus ensure California reaches its educational degree and completion goals.

Support
Los Angeles Community College District (Co-Sponsor)
California Catholic Conference
California Language Teachers Association

Opposition
None on File.

For More Information
Marilyn Limon
Assemblmember Miguel Santiago, AD53
916-319-2053 | Marilyn.Limon@asm.ca.gov
Date of Hearing: April 17, 2018

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Jose Medina, Chair
AB 2575 (Santiago) – As Amended April 5, 2018

[Note: This bill is doubled referred to the Assembly Education Committee and will be heard by that Committee as it relates to issues under its jurisdiction.]


SUMMARY: Authorizes the governing body of a private school, including a parochial school, to enter into a College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnership agreement with the governing board of a community college district, and requires the CCAP partnership agreement to comply with all applicable requirements, as specified.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district, upon recommendation of the principal of a student's school of attendance, and with parental consent, to authorize a student who would benefit from advanced scholastic or vocational work to attend a community college as a special part-time or full-time student. Additionally, current law prohibited a principal from recommending, for community college summer session attendance, more than five percent of the total number of students in the same grade level and exempted from the five percent cap a student recommended by his or her principal for enrollment in a college-level summer session course if the course in which the pupil was enrolled met specified criteria. These exemptions were repealed on January 1, 2014 (Education Code (EC) Section 48800, et seq.).

2) Prohibits a pupil enrolled in a public school from being required to pay a pupil fee for participation in an educational activity; and, specifies that all of the following requirements apply to the prohibition:

   a) All supplies, materials, and equipment needed to participate in educational activities shall be provided to pupils free of charge;

   b) A fee waiver policy shall not make a pupil fee permissible;

   c) School districts and schools shall not establish a two-tier educational system by requiring a minimal educational standard and also offering a second, higher educational standard that pupils may only obtain via payment of a fee or purchase of additional supplies that the school district does not provide; and,

   d) A school district or school shall not offer course credit or privileges related to educational activities in exchange for money or donations of goods or services from a pupil or a pupil's parents or guardians, and a school district or school shall not remove course credit or privileges related to educational activities, or otherwise discriminate against a pupil, because the pupil or the pupil's parents or guardians did not or will not provide money or donations of goods or services to the school district or school (EC Section 49011).
3) Requires the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) to report to the Department of Finance and Legislature annually on the amount of full-time equivalent students (FTES) claimed by each CCC district for high school pupils enrolled in non-credit, non-degree applicable, and degree applicable courses; and provides that, for purposes of receiving state apportionments, CCC districts may only include high school students within the CCC district’s report on FTES if the students are enrolled in courses that are open to the general public, as specified. Additionally, current law requires the governing board of a CCC district to assign a low enrollment priority to special part-time or full-time students in order to ensure that these students do not displace regularly admitted community college students (EC Sections 76001 and 76002).

4) Authorizes the governing board of a community college district to enter into a CCAP partnership with the governing board of a school district for the purpose of offering or expanding dual enrollment opportunities for students who may not already be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education, with the goal of developing seamless pathways from high school to community college for career technical education or preparation for transfer, improving high school graduation rates, or helping high school pupils achieve college and career readiness; and authorizes the governing board of a community college district participating in a CCAP partnership agreement to exempt special part-time students, as specified, from various fee requirements, as specified (EC Section 76004).

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:** Dual enrollment. According to the United States Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences Transition to College, *What Works Clearinghouse Report* of February 2017, dual enrollment programs allow high school pupils to take college courses and earn college credits while still attending high school.

Such programs, also referred to as concurrent enrollment, dual credit, or early college programs, are designed to increase college access and degree attainment, especially for students typically underrepresented in higher education. According to the report, dual enrollment programs support college credit accumulation and degree attainment via at least three mechanisms:

1) Allowing high school students to experience college-level courses helps them prepare for the social and academic requirements of college while having the additional supports available to them as high school pupils (this could reduce the need for developmental coursework).

2) Students who accumulate college credits early and consistently are more likely to attain a college degree.

3) Many dual enrollment programs offer discounted or free tuition, which reduces the overall cost of college and may increase the number of low socioeconomic status students who can attend and complete college.

*College and Career Access Pathways partnership (CCAP).* Community college districts have several statutorily authorized methods by which apportionment can be claimed for minors enrolled by the district. However, a variety of conditions must be met by CCC districts that admit special part-time students.
In an effort to expand the availability of dual enrollment programs to a broader range of students, AB 288 (Holden) Chapter 618, Statutes of 2015, created another category of special admit options, the CCAP. The intent of this new pathway was to serve lower achieving students in an effort to reduce remediation, increase degree completion, decrease time to degree, and stimulate interest in higher education among high school students for students who may not already be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education.

Committee Staff understands that the program was structured to authorize a model more like the Long Beach Promise that offers dual enrollment as a pathway, rather than a series of disconnected individual courses, and to provide greater flexibility in the delivery of courses at the high school campus. Unlike other concurrent enrollment options, AB 288 authorized community colleges to offer courses that are closed to the general public if offered on a high school campus, to grant special admit students higher enrollment priority than currently possible, and to exceed the current 11-unit cap per semester if the student is receiving both a high school diploma and an associate’s degree.

In exchange for the greater flexibility, CCAP program districts must meet a variety of requirements relative to instructors, job displacement, preserving access for adult students, and allowances and apportionments.

To note, while districts may operate a dual enrollment partnership through an early college high school or middle college high school, they are prohibited from operating as a CCAP partnership unless they comply with the provisions established by AB 288.

Need for the measure. According to the author, "Servicing students should be based on the needs of the students and not the format of the education that they are being provided". The author contends that based on the positive impact of dual enrollment, the state should ensure that students who do not attend public schools should be afforded the same opportunities to benefit from dual enrollment as those students who attend public schools.

This measure will authorize private schools, including parochial schools, to be eligible to enter into CCAP partnership agreements with their local community college districts.

Committee comments. Legality? Per the California Constitution, Article XVI, Sections 3 and 5, no money shall ever be appropriated or drawn from the State Treasury for the purpose or benefit of any corporation, association, asylum, hospital, or any other institution not under the exclusive management and control of the State as a state institution, nor shall any grant or donation of property ever be made thereto by the State. Additionally, neither the Legislature, nor any county, city and county, township, school district, or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, or grant anything to or in aid of any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, or help to support or sustain any school, college or university, hospital, or other institution controlled by any religious creed, church, or sectarian denomination.

Under the guidelines of the CCAP, high school pupils are taught college level courses that do not allow for college students and the community to enroll and take the same class; this is known as a closed campus course. Based on Article XVI, Section 5 of the State Constitution, Committee Staff is not sure if, by adding parochial schools to be eligible to participate in the CCAP, a violation of the Constitution would ensue.
Moving forward, the author may wish to work directly with the Legislative Counsel Bureau in order to address any potential legal issues in the implementation of this measure.

Author's intent? Committee staff understands that the author's intent is to ensure parity exists for underrepresented students attending private and parochial schools with that of underrepresented students attending public schools.

To ensure the author's intent is achieved, moving forward, the author may wish to amend this bill to require that private and parochial schools would be eligible to participate in a CCAP partnership agreement if they have a specified percentage of enrolled students who come from homes with incomes between 130 percent and 185 percent of the poverty level, qualifying them for participation in the National School Lunch Program.

To note, California provides financial assistance to private and parochial schools under the Child Nutrition Program. The funding reimburses the school cafeteria accounts based upon the number of qualifying meals served to students (EC Sections 41311, 49530.5, and 49531).

Related legislation. AB 2891 (Holden), which will be heard by this Committee today, authorizes charter schools to be eligible to participate in the CCAP.

AB 2871 (Eduardo Garcia), which is pending a hearing by this Committee, in part, commencing with the 2019–20 school year, authorizes a high school district within the county and the community college to allow high school teachers of the district, who do not already have a master’s degree in their subject area, to teach a college course on the high school campus pursuant to a CCAP agreement, if the teachers have been deemed qualified, as specified.

ACR 150 (Limón), which is pending referral by the Senate Rules Committee, recognizes the week of March 18, 2018, to March 24, 2018, inclusive, as Dual Enrollment Week in California.

Prior legislation. There have been many bills introduced in the last several years that attempt to address concurrent enrollment and the five percent cap, including, but not limited to the following bills:

1) AB 2364 (Holden), Chapter 299, Statutes of 2016, in part, required a community college district to exempt all special part-time students, as specified, from nonresident fees and allows these students to be reported as resident FTES to receive associated state apportionments.

2) AB 288 (Holden), Chapter 618, Statutes of 2015, in part, until January 1, 2022, authorized the governing board of a community college district to enter into a CCAP partnership with the governing board of a school district within its immediate service area, as specified, to offer or expand dual enrollment opportunities for students who may not already be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education with the goal of developing seamless pathways from high school to community college for career-technical education or preparation for transfer, improving high school graduation rates, or helping high school pupils achieve college and career readiness.

3) AB 1451 (Holden), of 2014, which was held on the Senate Appropriations Committee Suspense File, was similar in nature to AB 288 of 2015.
4) AB 1540 (Hagman), of 2014, which was held on the Assembly Appropriations Committee Suspense File, would, in part, specify that the governing board of a school district may authorize a pupil, at the recommendation of a community college dean of a computer science department or another appropriate community college computer science administrator, and with parental consent, to attend a community college during any session or term as a special part-time or full-time student and to undertake one or more computer science courses offered at the community college.

5) AB 2352 (Chesbro), of 2014, which was held on the Senate Appropriations Committee Suspense File, would, in part, remove early and middle college high school students concurrently enrolled at a CCC from receiving low priority admission status.

6) AB 160 (Portantino), of 2011, which was held on the Senate Appropriations Committee Suspense File, removed certain restrictions on concurrent enrollment and authorized school districts to enter into partnerships with CCC districts to provide high school pupils opportunities for advanced scholastic work, career technical education, or other coursework at CCC campuses.

7) AB 230 (Carter), Chapter 50, Statutes of 2011, exempted a pupil attending a middle college high school from the requirement that CCC governing boards assign a low enrollment priority to concurrent enrollment students if that pupil is seeking to enroll in a CCC course that is required for the pupil's middle college high school program.

8) SB 1437 (Padilla), Chapter 718, Statutes of 2008, extended the sunset date from January 1, 2009 until January 1, 2014 for which AB 1451 of 2014 sought to further extend the sunset.

9) SB 1303 (Runner), Chapter 648, Statutes of 2006, exempted from the specified five percent cap on CCC summer session enrollment, a pupil recommended by his or her principal if the pupil met specified criteria.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Catholic Conference
California Language Teachers Association
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)

Opposition

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Jeanice Warden / HIGHER ED. / (916) 319-3960
Assembly Bill 3101: Community College Application Accessibility Act – Fact Sheet

**SUMMARY**
This bill would require the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCC) to revise the lengthy and complicated CCCApply application so that it is accessible and efficient for all applicants.

**BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM**
The current CCCApply application can be difficult to complete for prospective students and an estimated 8 percent fail to complete it. That leads to tens of thousands of students failing to move forward with their higher education, an education shortage that this state cannot afford. A study by the Public Policy Institute of California found that if recent trends continue, “California is likely to face a shortage of workers with some college education but less than a bachelor’s degree by 2025.” The future gap may be as high as 1.5 million, a shortage the state’s workers and economy cannot afford.

According to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office students completing the application for admissions to the community college system require an average of 1.09 hours submit. The questions on the application are often repetitive, many overlap with the FAFSA application, and asked at multiple points within the same application. In addition, based on the over 4 million applications studied, nearly 10 percent of the applications are submitted on a different day than the application was started and 5.13% of applications statewide are never completed. The colleges with the highest abandonment rate range from 7% to 11% abandonment.

**SOLUTION**
AB 3101 will ensure that the Board of Governors starts the process of simplifying and shortening the CCCApply application. As the trusted leadership body of the CCC their expertise is critical to ensure the updates reflect the needs of prospective students. CCCs take the “top 100 percent” of our future college graduates and we must ensure that they are supported, not discouraged, at the very first step of the process.

There should be an examination of the data that is critical for the State to collect and a review of how best to collect that information. This information should inform the process for the redesign of the CCCApply application.

**SUPPORT**
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)

**OPPOSITION**
None known at this time.

**STAFF CONTACT**
Abram Diaz
Legislative Aide
State Capitol, Room 2161
(916) 651-2051
Abram.diaz@asm.ca.gov
Date of Hearing: April 17, 2018

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Jose Medina, Chair
AB 3101 (Carrillo) – As Introduced February 16, 2018

SUBJECT: Community colleges

SUMMARY: Requires the Board of Governors (BOG) of the California Community Colleges (CCC), on or before July 31, 2019, to revise the CCCApply application and enrollment process so that only data that is required by the federal government, or that is otherwise necessary, is collected during the process. Specifically, this bill:

1) Requires that, on or before July 31, 2019, the BOG shall revise the CCCApply application and enrollment process so that only data that is required by the federal government, or that is otherwise necessary, as determined by the board, is collected during the process. To the extent that data can be collected from the student at a later time, the board shall delay the collection of that data until after the student is enrolled.

2) Makes findings and declarations, including:

   a) The system by which students apply to community colleges is known to be cumbersome and create a barrier to access for many students who are seeking to access community college;

   b) The application process can take a student hours to complete due to the amount of information it requests; and,

   c) The state has documented a significant abandonment rate in regards to the number of students who begin the application process, but fail to complete it. Consequently, many students fail to complete the process and never enroll.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Differentiates the missions and functions of public and independent institutions of higher education. Under these provisions:

   a) The primary mission of the California State University (CSU) is required to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master’s degree. The CSU is authorized to establish two-year programs only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees and the CCC Board of Governors. The CSU is also authorized to jointly award the doctoral degree with the University of California (UC), and with one or more independent institutions of higher education.

   b) The UC is authorized to provide undergraduate and graduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over graduate instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine. The UC is also the primary state-supported academic agency for research.
c) The independent institutions of higher education are required to provide undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in accordance with their respective missions.

d) The mission and function of the CCC is the offering of academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level and the CCC are authorized to grant the associate in arts and the associate in science degree. The community colleges are also required to offer remedial instruction, English as a Second Language instruction, and adult noncredit instruction, and support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level. (Education Code Section 66010.4)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown.

**COMMENTS:** Need for the bill. According to the author, “The system by which students enroll in the Community College system is known to be cumbersome and creates a barrier for access to many students. This process does not need to be complicated or difficult to complete, given the fact that the Community Colleges accept 100 [percent] of the students eligible to enroll. This bill would require the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to revise the lengthy and complicated CCCApply application so that it is accessible and efficient for all applicants.”

Background. Since 2001, CCCApply has served over 10 million students applying to one or more of 114 California Community Colleges, generating over one million submitted applications per year. In 2011, the CCCApply master development contract between the CCC Chancellor's Office and the Xap Corporation expired, allowing the CCC Technology Center to develop a new version of CCCApply and a statewide student account system called OpenCCC.

In their 2017 annual report, the CCC Technology Center noted that research was being conducted due to concerns from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) and from individual campuses “regarding the length of the Standard application, and that students may be abandoning the application due the length.” The 2017 Annual Report also noted that the CCC Academic Senate had raised concerns that the current application “creates barriers for [non-credit] students, both in regards to the lengthy process, as well as the overall relevance of the questions for this population.”

**CCCApply Abandonment Report.** The CCC Technology Center released a “CCCApply Application Abandonment Report” in February of 2017. That report found that, from 2012-2016, the average application abandonment rate was 5.13%. The colleges with the highest abandonment rate range from 7% to 11% abandonment, and some of those colleges with the highest rates are located in communities with low college attainment rates. The report also observed that “personal information” page on CCCApply was the area where students were most likely to abandon their application, with a 23% abbonement rate observed on average.

Recommendations in the report are generally consistent with the provisions of AB 3101. The report noted that the CCC Technology Center “…may want to pursue a review toward removing any non-essential personal and/or education-related questions. The net effect of this action would be to reduce application complexity, thereby also improving the student application experience.”

**Arguments in support.** Several CCC districts have expressed their support for this legislation. The sponsor of this legislation, the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), noted that, “…the current CCCApply application is difficult to complete for prospective students and
an estimated average of 5% have to abandon the effort. Unfortunately, that percentage trends closer to 10% at the highest abandonment colleges, including several in the [LACCD]. These trends deter tens of thousands of students from starting their educational journey. This worsens an education shortage that California cannot afford.”

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Cerritos Community College District
Coastline Community College
Community College League of California
Contra Costa Community College District
Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District
Golden West Community College
Kern Community College District
Lassen Community College District
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)
Los Rios Community College District
North Orange Community College District
Orange Coast College
Peralta Community College District
San Bernardino Community College District
Solano Community College District
Southwestern Community College District

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Kevin J. Powers / HIGHER ED. / (916) 319-3960