

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, September 21, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, R. Else, J. Friedlander, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Monda, K. Neufeld, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: S. Ehrlich, T. Garey, D. Nevins

GUESTS: C. Alsheimer, M. Croninger, J. Meyer, K. O'Connor, A. Orozco, L. Stark, L. Vasquez

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of minutes of September 7 meeting (attached)

M/S/C [Alarcon/Bishop] to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2010 CPC Meeting.

Superintendent/President Serban congratulated VP Arellano for the Community Education Center recognition by the Mexican Consulate. The Community Education Center was honored as the Community Organization of the Year at the event the Mexican Consulate held on September 15th for the Mexican Independence Day. Dr. Serban stated that this is an important recognition because it shows the excellent outreach of Dr. Arellano and her staff in creating an important partnership with the local Hispanic community.

Information Items/Announcements

2. The basic skills/degree/transfer express initiative.

- Executive VP Friedlander reported on the status of the degree and transfer initiative that is being developed.
- A workgroup was formed to work on this initiative, the Degree Transfer Express Program, part of this program – the basic skills component - would to be funded by the Title V Grant. The College will know by September 30th if we were awarded this grant. Because this is such an important initiative, Superintendent/President Serban stated that she wants to see it supported if not through the Title V grant, then through re-allocation of some existing general fund, some fundraised money and through other grants. Dr. Friedlander noted that there is much momentum right now that we are going to keep moving

forward on developing the infrastructure to support the students who want to make the commitment to this program.

- This initiative's focus is to move qualified and committed students through basic skills and college classes in an accelerated fashion. The English Division, Math Dept and ESL are working together to develop immersion courses so students can finish multiple courses in one semester. The goal is to have this program ready to go by Fall 2011.
- Dr. Friedlander explained that first the student would go through a screening process. The student will be given clear program guidelines, letting them know what is expected of them in order to stay in the program and what the benefits are. The benefits are the tools that the college will offer the students access to, in order to support them in their endeavors, such as ensuring financial aid and counseling to keep them on track with their educational plan and career development. Students will be expected to stay enrolled full-time throughout the program.
- Dr. Friedlander reiterated appreciation for the Superintendent/President stepping forward and stating that we want to make sure this initiative gets funded.
- Superintendent/President Serban discussed different avenues of possible funding through the Foundation for SBCC and the SB Foundation. The Degree Transfer Express program is very much tied to the impact on the Santa Barbara community and the individuals who are at risk in our community.
- Associated Student Body President Garfinkel asked how students will be able to find out about this. Dr. Friedlander stated that there will be an aggressive marketing campaign focused on SBCC students and in the high schools encouraging them to apply.
- Superintendent/President Serban concluded by saying that this program will take a significant effort from everyone. Dr. Serban said that in order for this program to be successful, the College needs to provide to the students enough financial aid or financial support to get what they need to stay enrolled full time. The reason for this is that the key requirement is that the students need to be full time for the two to three year duration. Unless we fully secure financial assistance for these students, we will not be able to sustain the program. In order for the students to succeed, we want them to have the resources to be able to stay once they commit to it.

Discussion Items

3. Confirm program review timeline for 2010-11 discussed in May 2010 (attached).
 - Superintendent/President Serban opened the discussion of the attached timeline. There was a group discussion regarding the new program review templates, what worked and did not work.
 - Academic Senate VP Neufeld brought up last year's experience the group had in meeting the timelines.
 - Reasonable timelines were discussed and dates agreed upon. The new timeline will be forwarded to the CPC Members.

4. Guidelines for completing the program reviews (handout)
 - The Planning & Resources (P&R) Committee prepared the draft of the Guidelines for completing the Program Review Resource Requests, which were reviewed by the Executive Committee (EC) who made some suggestions for revision. The CPC Members discussed and clarified points on this document and came up with agreed upon Guidelines which will be distributed to each of the members' constituencies.

5. College-wide priorities for 2010-11 (attached) – All
 - Superintendent/President Serban asked that all areas review and discuss this attachment: The College-wide Priorities. Dr. Serban reviewed each of the priorities on the attachment. Some of the highlights were:
 - Every three years the College develops a new college plan. SBCC's process begins the Spring before the previous plan has ended. Dr. Serban explained that part of the process of developing the new College plan is that the College prepares an environmental scan which is a combination of information regarding demographic, economic, and various other trends developing on the South Coast. In past years, this information has been presented to the College by people from the UCSB Economic Forecast Project, from SB County and from the City. The process in past years has worked very well. There are many iterations of the plan due to discussions and revisions of all governance groups on campus. Dr. Serban said that at the next CPC meeting, there will be further discussion on the timeline using last cycle's timeline as a template. Dr. Serban stated that the outcome of all the work of the Distance Education Workgroup will be brought to CPC for further discussion and that information will be part of what informs the overall college plan effort. We also want to see what we can implement this year.
 - There is a requirement from the State to implement an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan. Former Campus Diversity Director Rodriguez worked on a draft based on the guidelines from the State which will be emailed by Dr. Serban to the CPC members for further examination. This is a large comprehensive document, prescribed by the State.
 - Superintendent/President Serban stated the importance of our Emergency Preparedness Plan. The college has had several trainings, and more structures are now in place and these will continue; however, there is more to do. The one structure the college will be focusing on is an Overall Business Continuity Plan. There are companies who assist colleges to put the business continuity plan into place. This plan entails plans for how the college is to run if an emergency occurs. All the operations of the college from payroll, to computers, to the telephone systems, generators, etc. are looked at, resulting in the Business Continuity Plan. One area college had an emergency drill that entailed working with the city and county agencies. CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultant Group

Auchincloss asked that the plan include directions for the classified staff from the different areas in the college since the last time there was an emergency it became confusing to the supervisors and those they manage.

- Superintendent/President Serban reminded the members that we are still working on the planning agendas in the Self Study that need to be completed. Of the 25 planning agendas about 14 of them have been fully completed. Dr. Serban said that one of the planning agendas was related to an accreditation requirement which is addressed in the work of the Distance Education Report. Dr. Serban stated that we definitely need to meet that requirement, under Standard IIA – Instructional Services.
- Superintendent/President ended this review stating that this looks like a lot for one year, but it is doable.

6. Equipment and construction funds 10-year history (attached)

- Superintendent/President Serban stated that this attachment is information that was requested by someone at the last CPC Meeting. It shows that basically there has been no infusion of money to these funds during the last two years due to the budget situation and because there was a need to have the flexibility of the general fund. Dr. Serban said that all members know this from the many discussions we have had in CPC about the budget, and are aware of the requests that have been made. As a result, we are going to put money into equipment and construction funds.

7. Construction projects that require additional funding from the general fund construction fund (attachments)

- VP Sullivan reported from these attachments. The attachment, SBCC Additional Maintenance Projects Needing Funding, lists the unfunded projects that are high priority and need to be addressed in 2010-11, the deferred maintenance projects that need to be addressed no later than 2011-12 and projects needed to be included in the Program Review that could wait to be done in 2011-12, all adding up to \$1.5 million. Sullivan stated that when there is as much square footage as the College has, including the Schott and Wake Centers, things do wear out and break down. Many of these projects have accumulated over a 10–15 year period, so that is why it is even more important to start putting money back into the construction fund. The second attachment, Preliminary Estimated Deferred Maintenance Project Schedule for MEASURE V Funded projects (unless otherwise noted) shows what has been completed and what still needs to be done with all the estimated costs listed. The costs are now at \$21.3 million, \$4 million over what the college set aside for these projects from Measure V.

8. Superintendent/President Serban stated that there is another restoration she would like to propose and that is a partial restoration of funding for 2011 – 12 sabbatical leaves. Dr. Serban said that she is mentioning the sabbatical restoration at this time because it requires planning on the instructional level as well as the planning for those taking

Sabbaticals. Dr. Serban reported that the highest amount for Sabbatical expenses in one fiscal year was \$340,000.00 and she proposed \$170,000 for 2011-12 Sabbaticals. Dr. Serban stated that this will be discussed further at the next CPC Meeting. Dr. Serban reminded the members that this is a restoration of something we used to fund and the funding stopped because of the budget crisis. Everything in the budget comes with the caveat that if the State cuts more money from our budget for 2011-12, the College will have to revisit the budget. Right now we are assuming that we are being funded at the same level we were funded this year.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 5, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Santa Barbara City College
PROJECT ABSTRACT

Santa Barbara City College is a public community college located 90 miles north of Los Angeles in a community in which Hispanics are the fastest growing segment of the population and the largest ethnic group feeder high schools in its service area. Over the past decade the College has served an increasing number of academically under-prepared students with diverse needs that severely test its ability to reach and maintain the levels of student progression and goal completion that it strives to achieve.

ACTIVITY: Express to Success Program

Strategies will increase the success, progression, degree completion and transfer rates of Hispanic and other underrepresented students who enter the college needing basic skills and ESL courses by providing clear and highly structured pathways from ESL to basic skills to associate degree and/or transfer.

Component One: Progression from Basic Skills to College-level Courses to Degree Completion and Transfer through activities to support *Accelerated Learning Communities*, an *ESL Immersion program*, *Academic Progression*, and strategies to *Strengthen Articulation strategies*.

Component Two: Develop Strategies to Strengthen Academic and Support Services to better serve underrepresented students. An array of student support strategies will be strengthened, a new *Student Pathways and Tracking System*, developed, *Intensive Orientation/Counseling* provided, and in-depth *Faculty and Staff Development Workshops* offered.

Component Three: Increasing Resource Development Capacity to Better Serve Underrepresented Students by strengthening the fiscal stability of the College and building the capacity to provide enhanced services and programs.

Throughout the Activity, SBCC has woven a response to the need for and access to financial and technology literacy skills for underrepresented students

PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION

The Title V project will be under the oversight of Superintendent/President of Santa Barbara City College and will be managed by Ms. Kathy Molloy.

Program Review Timelines for 2010-11 September 24, 2010

August 23, 2010 - Fall semester begins

October 4, 2010 - Program Reviews Need to Be Completed by All Departments/Units

All areas of the program review need to be updated, as needed, and new information added, as applicable. The completion of the program reviews includes:

- New resource requests (if needed)
- Update on the status of goals and objectives for 2009-10
- New/revised goals and objectives for 2010-11
- Update information in program reviews submitted in 2009-10

The information included in the 2009-10 program reviews for each unit/department with a completed program review was rolled over into the 2010-11 templates for editing and updating purposes.

October 19, 2010 – 1pm – 2:50pm – A 218C – Preliminary Review of Resource Requests by a group comprised of the following individuals: Robert Else (will chair the review meeting), Vice Presidents Arrellano, Bishop, Ehrlich, Friedlander, Sullivan, Classified Consultation Group (CCG) Chair Liz Auchincloss, Instructional Technology Committee (ITC) Chair Laurie Vasquez, and Planning and Resource Committee (P&R) Chair Kim Monda. The resulting changes, if needed, will be discussed by Robert Else with responsible department chairs and managers who will make the actual changes in their program reviews.

November 2, 2010 - Revised resource request reports will be distributed to EC, CPC, CCG, DTC, ITC, P&R, Academic Senate and Student Senate (SS).

February 9, 2011 – Academic Senate rankings (reflecting the rankings from ITC and P&R), Classified Consultation Group rankings, and Student Senate rankings (if the Student Senate wants to provide such rankings) to Superintendent/President Serban

Academic Senate, ITC and P&R rank resource requests from instructional program reviews and faculty-led student services program reviews; not operational program reviews

February 22, 2011 - CPC receives rankings from Executive Committee (EC), Academic Senate, CCG and SS (if they want to provide any).

March 1, 2011 – Resource requests and rankings discussed at CPC.

March 22, 2011 - Resource requests and rankings discussed at CPC.

April 5, 2011 - CPC completes rankings and provides recommendations regarding amount of money to be allocated for 2011-12.



October 1, 2010

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BILLS OF INTEREST

CHAPTERED

AB 185 (J. Perez) Education: Federal Funds

Analysis/Summary: This bill appropriates \$903,845,000 from the Federal Trust Fund (Fund) to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCC), State Department of Education, University of California, and the California State University for the 2010-11 fiscal year. The CCC will be appropriated \$5,000,000 from the Fund.

AB 1713 (Furutani) California Community Colleges: Reporting Requirements (Sponsor/Support)

Analysis/Summary: This bill consolidates the concurrent enrollment reporting requirements, moves the report for career development courses from March to July, and deletes the outdated reporting requirement on adult education and noncredit data collection.

AB 1901 (Ruskin) Postsecondary Education: Master Plan for Higher Education (Support)

Analysis/Summary: This bill adds the report of the Joint Committee for the Master Plan for Higher Education. It also establishes legislative intent that the committee be used as a guide for higher education policy.

AB 2086 (Coto) Public Postsecondary Education: Federal Assistance: Publication of Professional Licensure Examination Passage Rates

Analysis/Summary: AB 2086 requires postsecondary institutions to provide information regarding where the public may access license examination passage rates for the most recently available year, if data is electronically available through a web site of a state licensing or regulatory agency. Postsecondary institutions may choose to place an Internet web site address with the required data on the institution's enrollment, application, and/or program information materials. Responsibility for certification of compliance rests with the postsecondary institution.

AB 2203 (Solorio) Public Postsecondary Education: College Textbooks

Analysis/Summary: AB 2203 requires the California State University Trustees, and encourages the University of California Regents, to review internal transfer policies and revise transfer policies to ensure that textbooks selected for transfer or general education courses may be used by the student for as long as the information in the textbook is current and reflects contemporary thinking in the discipline.

AB 2297 (Brownley) Community Colleges: Nonresident Fees

Analysis/Summary: This bill allows local CCC governing boards to adopt a nonresident fee that is no greater than the average of nonresident fees of public community colleges in 12 states with comparable costs of living, based on a cost-of-living index as determined by the United States Department of Labor or a cooperating government agency.

AB 2302 (Fong) Postsecondary Education: Student Transfer (Support)

Analysis/Summary: AB 2302 complements the transfer pathway program established by SB 1440 (Padilla). The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and the California State University (CSU) are required to collaboratively develop effective methods of advising the public about the new transfer pathway, including use of web sites. The Chancellor's Office is required to establish a process to facilitate the identification of community college courses systemwide that satisfy lower division preparation requirements and to include this process in a report to be submitted to the Legislature. Community college and CSU faculty are directed to consider existing local articulation agreements in developing the new associate degree for transfer.

AB 2344 (Nielsen) Nursing: Approved Schools

Analysis/Summary: AB 2344 redefines "institution of higher education" for the purposes of approving schools of nursing to include community colleges and for-profit private postsecondary institutions offering an associate of arts or associate of science degree, and clarifies a nursing school that is not an "institution of higher education" may affiliate with an institution of higher education offering either an associate of arts or an associate of science degree.

AB 2385 (J. Perez) Community Colleges: Accelerated Nursing and Allied Health Care Pilot Program (Support)

Analysis/Summary: This bill establishes a pilot nursing and Allied Health pilot program at up to five campuses under the direction of the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Implementation is contingent on the availability of supplemental funds and the Chancellor's Office is directed to pursue a variety of funding sources. Qualifying programs must provide certified training, include high quality curriculum and have the ability to expand programs as needed. The purpose of the pilot program is to develop innovative models that expand the state's capacity to prepare a qualified health care workforce. Upon implementation of the pilot program, the Chancellor's Office will evaluate the effectiveness of the program and report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2017.

SB 82 (Hancock) Community Colleges: Transportation Fees

Analysis/Summary: This bill increases the limits on the transportation fees. Increased fees in transportation will be determined by the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases of Goods and Services published by the United States Department of Commerce. The bill also repeals the provisions that prohibit a governing board from entering into, or extending a contract for, transportation services provided by a common carrier or municipally owned transit system unless approved by a vote of the students.

This bill follows prior legislation for specified districts and last year's AB 774 (Cook) that authorizes all districts to charge transportation fees to students and employees if approved by a majority of students and employees at the district. SB 82 removes the limit on fees. Several districts have used the current statute to provide mass transit services.

SB 1075 (Correa) Military Service: Benefits

Analysis/Summary: This bill requires that if a student is called to active, full-time military duty that interrupts the individual's course of study, the institution is required to make arrangements to reasonably accommodate and assist the student in meeting all coursework requirements that he or she

may have missed due to compulsory military service. This would apply to both private and public postsecondary institutions.

SB 1143 (Liu) Community College Student Success and Completion (Support)

Analysis/Summary: This bill requires the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (BOG) to convene a task force to examine best practices and models throughout the nation for improving student success within California's Community Colleges. The BOG is required to report to the Legislature no later than March 1, 2012 on its proposed plan to improve student success and completion.

SB 1332 (Dutton) Radiologic Technology (Support)

Analysis/Summary: SB 1332 requires the Department of Public Health (DPH) to approve schools that meet the Joint Review Committee of Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) standards. The bill also requires the department to adopt the standards through a specified process before approving schools. Since 1996, JRCERT standards have been accepted in lieu of the California Department of Public Health's Title 17 regulations that were established in 1985. SB 1332 would preclude DPH from suddenly enforcing outdated regulations and use the JRCERT accreditation process utilized by the state over the past 14 years, rather than the 1985 regulations.

Title 17 regulations for Radiologic Technology Programs are widely considered to be outdated and not reflective of current needs. CSU and community college program directors state that compliance with the outdated Title 17 regulations would put their national certification in jeopardy. Even though Title 17 regulations are outdated, DPH has the authority to enforce these regulations. DPH attempted to enforce these regulations in 2007 and numerous college programs as well as clinical placement facilities were put on notice that their programs were deemed out of compliance. This bill clarifies that colleges who meet JRCERT standards are in compliance with the law.

SB 1440 (Padilla) California Community Colleges: Student Transfer (Sponsor/Support)

Analysis/Summary: SB 1440 establishes the Student Transfer Achievement Reform (STAR) Act. SB 1440 requires a community college district to grant an associate degree for transfer to a student in that student's field of study once a student has met degree and transfer requirements for a particular major. Upon completion of the transfer associate degree, the student is eligible for transfer with junior standing into the California State University (CSU) system. Students will be given priority consideration when applying to a particular program that is similar to the student's community college area of emphasis. The bill prohibits a community college district or campus from adding local course requirements in addition to requirements of the STAR Act, and prohibits the CSU from requiring a transferring student to repeat courses similar to those taken at the community college that counted toward their associate degree for transfer.

SB 1473 (Wyland) School Facilities Bond Proceeds: Performance Audits (Support)

Analysis/Summary: SB 1473 mandates that all Proposition 39 mandatory performance and financial audits conform to the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). GAGAS standards are promulgated under the leadership of the Comptroller General of the United States, who heads the U.S. General Accounting Office.

VETOED

AB 194 (Torrico) Retirement: Local Employees

Analysis/Summary: AB 194 would have capped retirement compensation for employees hired after January 1, 2011 under either the State Teachers' Retirement System or Public Employees' Retirement System for any employee at 125% of the compensation of the Governor in 2009 which was \$173,987 (125% equals \$217,483). The cap would not have placed a limit on salary levels, but on pensionable salary.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 194 without my signature.

The bill limits the salary that retirement benefits are based on for individuals, prospectively after January 1, 2011, to 125% of the Governor's salary, as specified.

The current compensation limit imposed by the federal government to determine public employee retirement benefits is \$245,000. Currently, this bill would cap the compensation counted towards retirement at \$217,483. While this two tiered cap that would be created by this bill would make a very small dent in the pension problem California faces, it cannot be considered real pension reform. I am still hopeful that the Legislature will pass an acceptable bill that addresses the real cost issues that have driven up the liability in public pension systems.

AB 827 (De La Torre) Local Public Employees Contracts

Analysis/Summary: AB 827 would have prohibited a local agency contract for "excluded employees"* executed or renewed on or after January 1, 2011 from containing:

- An automatic contract renewal.
- An automatic compensation increase that exceeds a cost of living adjustment.
- An automatic compensation increase that is linked to a third-party contract, including agreements under the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act or the Education Code's employee relations provisions.
- A severance payment greater than the amount allowed by current law.

The bill also would have required that the results of the performance review for exempt employees be summarized in an open session of the governing board before a compensation increase greater than the consumer price index is approved (any raise after January 1, 2011).

*An excluded employee is a person who is or will be employed by, and report directly to, the Legislative body of a local governing board that is not subject to the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act and the Public Records Act.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 827 without my signature.

The scandal with the City of Bell was a disgraceful use of public funds. I share the public outrage expressed over the abuses attributed to the City of Bell's management of employee contracts. Assembly Bill 827 presents good public policy in that it provides transparency with regards to some municipal personnel contracts, but it should be applied to all public employees, including labor union members and state employees. I encourage the Legislature to enact thoughtful and meaningful solutions rather than a rushed proposal that is severely limited in its application.

AB 1413 (Fuentes and Coto) Student Financial Aid: Eligibility

Analysis/Summary: AB 1413 would have established the California Dream Act of 2010 for purposes of permitting AB 540 students to apply for the Cal Grant student aid program if they meet requirements for nonresident tuition exemption. AB 1413 specifies that these students would only be able to receive a Competitive Cal Grant A or B award, if funding remains after all other eligible non-AB 540 students have received grants. The bill also broadens the definition of nonresident tuition students eligible for an AB 540 exemption to include graduates of adult education and technical schools provided the individual spent at least one year in a California high school. Enactment of AB 1413 was contingent upon SB 1460 (Cedillo) being signed into law.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 1413 without my signature.

I have always wholeheartedly supported the policy of making higher education opportunities as affordable as possible for all California's students. Our state's university and community college systems are amongst the finest in the country and should be made accessible to those seeking a better life through higher education. Unfortunately, given the precarious fiscal situation that the state faces, it would not be practical to adopt a new policy that could limit the financial aid available to students that are in California legally, in order to provide that benefit to those students who are not.

Since the beginning of the year, I have committed to provide the highest amount of funding for higher education, including for financial aid to needy students, that I believe is prudent given all of the competing interest for limited resources. Given the difficult decisions that are yet to be made to enact a state budget, I am still hopeful that the funding level that I have proposed for higher education will still be enacted. However, with that uncertainty coupled with the ongoing fiscal liabilities California will continue to face in the coming years, the State needs to be especially cautious in even considering enacting a measure like this.

AB 1987 (Ma) Public Retirement: Final Compensation: Retirees

Analysis/Summary: AB 1987 would have established minimum standards and requirements for all public retirement systems in California with respect to final compensation, ongoing audits with penalties for noncompliance, and prohibitions against a retiree from immediately returning to employment with the public employer on a part-time or contract basis. This bill would have prohibited members of the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) or State Teachers' Retirement System (STRS) who retire after January 1, 2012 from working (including part-time or under contract) for a PERS/STRS employer for 180 days after retirement. The bill also limited what can be included in calculations that determine final retirement compensation. For example, if AB 1987 had been enacted only one year of accrued vacation time is permitted to be included in final compensation calculations versus an unlimited amount of vacation time which is currently allowed. This legislation is "double-joined" with SB 1425 (Simitian) and would only have been operative if both bills were signed into law.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 1987 without my signature.

The practice of pension-spiking is a serious one that deserves significant attention by the Legislature in curbing the unacceptable manner in which individual workers are able to artificially boost their retirement payouts. There are numerous examples of public employees taking home larger pension checks in retirement than what they earned in base salary when they were actually working. California does need a consistent standard that is transparent, understandable, and implementable throughout the state. While this bill purports to address this issue by segregating out some of the factors that have allowed pension spiking, in some instances it still allows local pension boards to determine what is ultimately counted in an employee's pension calculation. This does not provide a consistent treatment of all employees. The

taxpayers of California deserve better. I am still hopeful that the Legislature can send me acceptable pension reform legislation.

AB 1997 (Portantino) California Community Colleges: Student Financial Aid Programs (Support)

Analysis/Summary: AB 1997 would have required the Chancellor's Office to implement a voluntary pilot program at up to 10 community colleges to identify strategies and best practices that increase student participation in both state and federal financial aid programs. The Chancellor's Office would have been required to submit a report to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) by January 10, 2013 regarding strategies and techniques used at the pilot sites. The LAO was directed to issue a report to the Legislature that includes recommendations for statewide expansion of the pilot, a statistical analysis of financial aid applications and awards before and after the pilot, and a summary of the major strategies and techniques employed by participating campuses.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 1997 without my signature.

This bill is unnecessary. Nothing under current law prohibits the California Community College Chancellor's Office from working with local community colleges to meet the objectives of this bill. Furthermore, the annual budget act was augmented several years ago to provide the community colleges an additional \$34.2 million for financial aid outreach efforts that were expected to assist students with maximizing federal and state financial aid.

AB 2682 (Block) Community Colleges: Student Assessments: Pilot Project (Sponsor/Support)

Analysis/Summary: This bill would have required the Board of Governors to establish a pilot project with the goal of creating a set of centralized common assessments in English, Math, and English as a Second Language. Colleges will be asked to use these online, common assessment tools at a fraction of the cost of their current assessments. These assessments would have been used for placement and advising. The Board of Governors would have been directed to convene an advisory committee for the pilot projects and report on specified progress by February 28, 2011.

Veto message:

I am returning Assembly Bill 2682 without my signature.

I respect the author's intent to reduce costs and create efficiencies for students and community colleges. However, I have concerns that this bill creates a duplication of the efforts that resulted from the expansion of the existing Early Assessment Program (EAP), which evaluates the college-readiness of high school students. I signed into law in 2008 the bill that expanded the use of the EAP operated by the California State Universities, to include community colleges. Therefore, it is unclear why this bill is necessary.

SB 330 (Yee) Public Records: State Agency: Auxiliary Organizations

Analysis/Summary: SB 330 would have added CCC, CSU, and UC foundations to the Public Records Act and adds provisions protecting the confidentiality of fundraising strategies and work-product that could be used by competitors. The bill would have been exempted from disclosure under the act the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who volunteer services or donate to specified entities if those persons request anonymity. This exemption would not apply if a volunteer or donor met specified conditions.

Veto message:

I am returning Senate Bill 330 without my signature.

While I am a firm believer in providing openness and transparency when it involves public entities and public funding, this bill inappropriately places private auxiliary organizations that receive private funds,

under the provisions of the California Public Records Act. The focus of our attention should be given to greater transparency of how the University of California and California State University systems spend the public funds from taxpayers or students. Instead, this bill would require disclosure of private donors, those generous alumni whose giving, especially in times of decreasing state funding, is helping keep our public universities the best in the world.

While the bill attempts to provide a veil of protection for donors requesting anonymity, as crafted, it will not provide sufficient protection for many who rightfully deserve a level of privacy as part of their giving. Often times, these generous private citizen donors do not want to be in the glare of publicity, and I cannot support a bill that makes it more difficult for our public universities to raise private funds to maintain the quality educational experience our students deserve, and parents expect, when they send their children to the University of California and California State University systems.

SB 675 (Steinberg) Partnership Academies: Clean Technology and Renewable Energy Job Training, Career Technical Education, and Dropout Prevention Program (Support)

Analysis/Summary: SB 675 would have required the California Energy Commission to set aside \$8 million annually over five years to fund start-up of an estimated 200 new academies in the growing job sectors of clean technology and renewable energy.

Veto message:

I am returning Senate Bill 675 without my signature.

SB 675 would allocate funds from the California Energy Commission's (Commission) Energy Resource Programs Account (ERPA) to the California Department of Education (CDE) for developing and maintaining programs that focus on employment and training for energy or water conservation, renewable energy, pollution reduction, or similar technologies. Throughout my tenure as Governor, I have been a staunch supporter of increasing career-tech education opportunities for our young men and women. I continue to believe that career-tech education has a vital role to play in helping to develop and sustain California's students and our emerging green economy.

Nonetheless, given the current uses of the ERPA account at the Commission and the precariously low balance in that fund, this bill would require the Commission to increase the surcharge on electricity users throughout California to pay for its provisions. And even after doing so, the Commission would still be required in the future to cut its core programs to pay for this bill, including those related to power plant licensing, renewable energy facility licensing, and energy efficiency.

More importantly, I will not support increasing the surcharge on electricity users to fund a K-12 Education program. To do so would start a dangerous precedent for finding unrelated revenue sources to fund, expand, or create K-12 programs outside of the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Additionally, the bill only gives a minor role to the Commission in developing the guidelines for the program. Just as the Commission is not an expert in navigating our state's complex education system, neither are CDE employees proficient in the emerging technologies and future of our green economy. As such, the Commission should be CDE's partner in putting together this program so as to provide our students with the right skills to enter our green economy.

If the program included in this bill was wholly funded using Proposition 98 dollars and a greater role was given to the Commission to develop guidelines in cooperation with the Department of Education, I would sign it.

SB 957 (Price) Student Financial Aid: Cal Grant C Awards

Analysis/Summary: SB 957 would have required the California Student Aid Commission to give priority for Cal Grant C awards to students pursuing training in fields with high employment need, high salary or wage projections, or high employment growth. It also called for a review and update to the areas of occupational and technical training for which students may utilize Cal Grant C awards at least every five years. The Legislative Analyst's Office would have been required to submit a report to the Governor and Legislature on the outcomes of the Cal Grant C program every other year beginning April 1, 2014.

Veto message:

I am returning Senate Bill 957 without my signature.

I am concerned that this bill could limit choices students or eliminate the possibility of an award for lower income students, simply because the occupational areas that they have chosen to pursue was not deemed a priority by the state.

SB 1425 (Simitian) Public Retirement: Final Compensation

Analysis/Summary: This bill would have prohibited members of Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) or State Teachers' Retirement System (STRS) who retire after January 1, 2012 from working (including part-time or under contract) for a PERS/STRS employer for 180 days after retirement. This bill specified that if a STRS retiree earns compensation in violation of this requirement, his or her retirement allowance would have been reduced by the amount of compensation earned in the prohibited period. This bill also made statutory changes to bring the provisions of the Teachers' Retirement Law (TRL) and the Public Employees' Retirement Law (PERL) into compliance with the new requirements imposed on all public retirement systems by this bill. This bill would have become operative for all active and future members of the retirement systems beginning July 1, 2011, and is "double joined" to passage of AB 1987 (Ma).

Veto message:

I am returning Senate Bill 1425 without my signature.

The enactment of this bill is contingent upon the enactment of Assembly Bill (AB) 1987 (Ma). I am vetoing AB 1987 because it does not provide real pension reform. I am still hopeful that the Legislature will pass an acceptable bill that really addresses California's pension problem.

SB 1460 (Cedillo) Student Financial Aid: Eligibility

Analysis/Summary: AB 1460 would have established the California Dream Act of 2010 and would have provided that a person who is eligible under AB 540 provisions is limited to eligibility to apply for institutional financial aid and scholarships derived from non-state funds, beginning January 1, 2011. AB 540 students would not be eligible to apply for state aid, i.e. the Cal Grant program. Under AB 540, non-resident fees are waived for students who have attended a California school three or more years, one of these years must be in high school, and graduated from a California secondary school.

Veto message:

I am returning Senate Bill 1460 without my signature.

I have always wholeheartedly supported the policy of making higher education opportunities as affordable as possible for all California's students. Our state's university and community college systems are amongst the finest in the country and should be made accessible to those seeking a better life through higher education. Unfortunately, given the precarious fiscal situation that the state faces, it would not be practical to adopt a new policy that could limit the financial aid available to students that are in California legally, in order to provide that benefit to those students who are not.

Since the beginning of the year, I have committed to provide the highest amount of funding for higher education, including for financial aid to needy students, that I believe is prudent given all of the competing interest for limited resources. Given the difficult decisions that are yet to be made to enact a state budget, I am still hopeful that the funding level that I have proposed for higher education will still be enacted. However, with that uncertainty, coupled with the ongoing fiscal liabilities California will continue to face in the coming years, the State needs to be especially cautious in even considering enacting a measure like this.

*Prepared by the Government Relations Division
California Community College Chancellor's Office*