

Budget Talking Points

Lifelong Learning Access

The repeatability restrictions in Title V regulations and the proposed elimination of state funding for certain non-credit adult education categories decrease access to education for lifelong learners. (Some of the points below from CCLC talking points on budget policy)

- A. We appreciate the governor's continued commitment to reinvest in unmet adult education needs throughout the state.
- B. We believe the AB 86 planning grants to regional consortia of community college districts and school districts will be fruitful and ensure local regions continue to close adult education achievement gaps.
- C. We support stopping legislation (SB 173) that would eliminate funding categories for adult education or otherwise compromise the AB 86 planning process.
- D. The categories being proposed for state funding elimination in SB 173 include these non-credit programs:
 - o Parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships;
 - o Education programs for older adults;
 - o Education programs for home economics; and,
 - o Health and safety education.
- E. Eliminating these programs from state funding decrease access to education.
- F. Education programs for older adults allow lifelong learning to continue and provide intellectual and physical benefits for a growing population in California.
- G. According to the Governor's 2014-15 Budget proposal, "the population of the retirement age group, those 65 and older, is expected to expand rapidly (20.7%)" over the next five years.
- H. The proposed legislation allows for these programs to be offered on a fee basis by community colleges; however, this would require a change in structure and format and the use of fees would be restricted.

Other

- 1. Support for the Governor's generally favorable budget for higher education, including the California Community College system
- 2. Given that many districts are not experiencing growth and yet are still struggling from the pre-Prop 30 budget reductions, the state should provide funding to be directed as a general increase to our general funds that are not categorical and not tied to growth. Such increases were realized in K-12, the CSU, and the UC.
- 3. Letters should acknowledge that Prop 30 revenue is short-term and to encourage law makers to block any new legislation that results in unfunded mandates or further requires CCCs to do additional work without additional resources. (It may appear that there is funding now yet Prop 30 funding is scheduled to end.)
- 4. Changes to repeatability need to be made for some parts of our curriculum, e.g., music ensembles.
- 5. In addition to supporting continuing education initiatives, the state should support a "co-enrollment" of first-time students and repeated students in some courses. The first-time

SB 965 (Funding stability for San Francisco City College)

Author: Senator Leno

Sponsor: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

Purpose: This bill, for the 2014-15 fiscal year to the 2017-18 fiscal year, inclusive, would require the board of governors to provide the San Francisco Community College District with revenues, as specified, if the community college district or a campus of the community college district is in imminent jeopardy of losing its accreditation and the board of governors has appointed a special trustee to manage the community college district.

- **BILL HISTORY**

Date	Action
02/20/14	Referred to Committee on Education.
02/11/14	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 13.
02/10/14	Introduced. Read first time. To Committee on Rules for assignment. To print.

- **TIMING** -- The bill must be in print for 31 days before any action can be taken on the bill (the 31st day is March 13). It is likely the bill will be heard by the Senate Education Committee near the end of March/early April.
- **POTENTIAL TO AMEND THE BILL** – Per Senator Monning’s staff, it is highly unlikely the author of the bill, Senator Leno, will exercise his prerogative to amend the bill to include MPC. The bill addresses San Francisco City College’s accreditation-related situation. It would be difficult to make the case to include MPC, whose loss of funding and enrollment decline is not due to loss of accreditation.
- **REPEATABILITY** – MPC’s enrollment has been reduced due to the effects of recent changes in state policy, such as repeatability. Senator Monning’s staff is well aware of the repeatability issue and the impacts on MPC and Cabrillo. It is unclear if a policy change is plausible at this time.
- **OPTIONS** -- A letter from the Board expressing concerns about MPC’s situation and including MPC as part of Senator Leno’s bill, could be submitted to Senator Monning.

Introduced by Senator Leno

February 10, 2014

An act to add Section 84750.6 to the Education Code, relating to community colleges, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 965, as introduced, Leno. Community colleges: funding: San Francisco Community College District.

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law authorizes the establishment of community college districts under the administration of community college governing boards, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction at community college campuses throughout the state.

Existing law requires the board of governors to develop criteria and standards, in accordance with specified statewide minimum requirements, for the purposes of making the annual budget request for the California Community Colleges to the Governor and the Legislature and allocating state general apportionment revenues. Those statewide minimum requirements include, among other things, a requirement that the calculations of each community college district's revenue level for each fiscal year be based on specified criteria, with revenue adjustments being made for increases or decreases in full-time equivalent students and for other specified purposes.

This bill, for the 2014–15 fiscal year to the 2017–18 fiscal year, inclusive, would require the board of governors to provide the San Francisco Community College District with revenues, as specified, if the community college district or a campus of the community college

1 (4) For the 2017–18 fiscal year, an amount not less than 85
2 percent of the total amount that was received by the community
3 college district for the attendance of FTES in the 2013–14 fiscal
4 year.

5 (c) The amounts calculated in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive,
6 of subdivision (b) shall be adjusted by the chancellor to reflect
7 cost-of-living adjustments, deficits in apportionments, or both, as
8 appropriate for the applicable fiscal years.

9 (d) Subdivision (b) shall only be used to determine the
10 apportionment funding to be allocated to the San Francisco
11 Community College District. In computing statewide entitlements
12 to funding based upon the attendance of FTES, the San Francisco
13 Community College District shall not be credited with more FTES
14 than were actually enrolled and in attendance.

15 (e) It is the intent of the Legislature that any amounts necessary
16 to make the apportionments required pursuant to subdivision (b)
17 be drawn from the state general apportionment revenues for
18 community college districts.

19 SEC. 2. The Legislature finds and declares that a special law
20 is necessary and that a general law cannot be made applicable
21 within the meaning of Section 16 of Article IV of the California
22 Constitution because of the unique accreditation and fiscal
23 challenges facing the San Francisco Community College District.

24 SEC. 3. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the
25 immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within
26 the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into
27 immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

28 The accreditation and fiscal problems facing the San Francisco
29 Community College District threaten its ability to preserve the
30 health and safety of its students and require an immediate response.