

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
AB 867	Nava	Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree	April 14, 2009	Assembly Higher Education Committee - hearing date 4/21/09
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
		April 15, 2009	Marlene Garcia	Barbara Whitney

Summary: This bill authorizes the California State University (CSU) to award a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, as specified. The degree is limited to the discipline of nursing practice as distinguished from the doctor of philosophy degree offered at the University of California.

Background: According to the CSU, the state faces an ever-increasing nursing shortage that jeopardizes the health and well-being of Californians. An estimated state shortage of 47,600 registered nurses is expected by 2010, and by 2020 the shortage is projected to reach 116,600 according to the Governor's California Nurse Education Initiative Annual Report, September 2006. Increasing the number of well-trained nursing faculty and practitioners is critical to the ability to expand nursing programs. This bill makes an exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education in permitting the CSU to award a Doctor of Nursing Practice.

In 2005, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed SB 724 (Scott), a measure that authorizes the CSU to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D) degree. The legislation specified that the degree focus on preparing administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges.

Policy Analysis: In authorizing the CSU to award the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, the CSU shall comply with the following:

- Train nurses for advanced nursing practice and prepare clinical faculty to teach in postsecondary nursing education programs. The degree shall be designed for working professionals.
- Per FTES funding for each new student in the degree program shall be included within CSU's enrollment growth levels; these enrollments shall not alter the CSU's ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, nor shall it diminish enrollment growth of undergraduate programs. Funding for this degree program will be based on the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the CSU receives for graduate enrollment.
- CSU shall provide any initial funding from within its existing budgets for academic programs and support without diminishing the quality of undergraduate programs.
- The CSU shall report annually on the status of the degree program to CPEC, LAO and the appropriate budget subcommittees in each house of the Legislature, as specified.

Fiscal Analysis: No Cost to the Community Colleges

Comments: The Community Colleges face similar challenges as the CSU in trying to increase the number of nursing degrees offered in the state, while struggling with limited resources, nursing faculty and clinical sites. This bill expands the state's capacity to train nursing faculty and expand clinical sites. The bill also strengthens the pipeline of nursing opportunities that potentially connect with community college ADN programs and ADN to BSN transfer pathway programs.

The CSU has been working with the Community Colleges this year in supporting AB 1295 (Fuller), a bill that requires the CSU system office to work with the Chancellor's Office in developing a more streamlined and efficient ADN to BSN transfer pathway for nursing students and ADN practitioners. AB 1295 is a complimentary measure to AB 867 (Nava) in that it helps build the pool of Master of Nursing and Doctor of Nursing Practice candidates.

**California Community Colleges
Government Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL NO.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
AB 1295	Fuller	Nursing Degree Transfer Pathway	02/27/09	Assembly Higher Ed. 04/13/2009
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
		4/10/09	Sonia Ortiz-Mercado	Barbara Whitney

Summary: AB 1295 streamlines the transfer pathway for community college students who earn their Associates Degree in Nursing (ADN), are licensed as a registered nurse and who apply to a California State University (CSU) to complete a Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN). This bill seeks to reduce unnecessary coursework and duplication and to create a more efficient ADN to BSN transfer pathway.

Background: Access to a quality nursing education through California's public postsecondary institutions is provided through 74 California community colleges and 22 California State Universities. The California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) is responsible for approving the comprehensive and quality nursing curriculum provided through the CCC's and CSU's and for licensing registered nurses who pass a standardized licensing exam. The RN licensing exam (NCLEX) statewide passage rates for CCC's compared to CSU's are similar (86% and 85%). At the bachelor's degree level, there is no common or standardized approach for recognizing ADN curriculum content and crediting a registered nurse with an associate's degree for that knowledge. The lack of a common nursing transfer pathway results in students having to take duplicative and/or unnecessary coursework that prolongs their time to degree and increases degree costs to both the student and state. These barriers act as a disincentive for students who wish to continue their education to earn the BSN. It is estimated that only 20% of community college ADN students continue on to earn a BSN.

Many of the nursing courses offered through a community college are approved by the BRN and are comparable to CSU upper division BSN coursework. For ADN transfer students, there are three core nursing classes that are required to earn the BSN that are not offered at the ADN level. These courses are: leadership, public/community health, and research. While the BRN approves nursing curriculum content for each institution, how the courses are structured, titled, and number of units associated with each course vary greatly between community colleges and CSU's. Degree requirements may also differ with institutions requiring between 70-100 units to earn the ADN and 120 or more units to earn the BSN.

Policy Analysis: The draft bill language requires the CCC's and CSU's to develop an articulated transfer pathway for ADN to BSN students. The bills reduces any duplication of coursework by requiring CSU to accept a minimum number of ADN transfer units and limits CSU from requiring any duplicative prerequisite courses. In addition, the bill limits CSU to requiring only those courses needed for the BSN and a minimum number of units to earn the degree, totaling no more than 120 units.

Fiscal Analysis: This bill would require Chancellor's Office staff to work with the CSU Chancellor's Office to develop and implement an articulated nursing degree transfer pathway. Staff estimates that the workload associated with coordination can be absorbed within existing agency resources.

Argument FOR: A streamlined nursing degree transfer pathway between community colleges and the California State Universities will result in a cost savings to both the student and California, make it less burdensome for community college nursing students to further their education, and reduce the time to degree.

Argument AGAINST: While the CSU Chancellor's Office has indicated there is a problem that needs to be addressed and has signaled support to work with the CCC's, it does not support limits in statute that would

require campuses to accept a specified number of ADN transfer units and that would possibly limit their flexibility in offering other nursing courses.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
AB 380	De La Torre	California Clean Energy Curriculum and Training Initiative of 2009	02/23/09	Passed Asm Utilities 4/14/2009 A-L& E
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
		04/15/09	Mike Magee	Econ and Workforce Dev

Summary: AB 380 requires the Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) to create the California Clean Energy Curriculum and Training Initiative of 2009 to establish a standardized curriculum for clean energy job training programs. This measure requires collaboration with the Workforce Investment Boards, Employment Training Panel, Division of Apprenticeship Standards and the Public Utilities Commission. Community college programs are recognized in the bill and may benefit from the curriculum developed through this initiative.

Background: AB 3018 (Nunez), Chapter 312, Statutes of 2008, enacted the California Green Collar Jobs Act of 2008 and requires the California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) to establish the Green Collar Jobs Council (Jobs Council). The Jobs Council is comprised of representatives from the CWIB, the California Community Colleges, and other members. The Jobs Council is required to develop the framework, funding strategies, programs, partnerships, and opportunities necessary to address the growing need for a highly skilled and well-trained workforce to meet the state's growing green economy. AB 380 seeks to advance the goals of AB 3018 through workforce development.

Policy Analysis: The purpose of this bill is to create a standardized curriculum for solar and other clean energy training programs. AB 380 seeks to provide opportunities for new jobs in the clean energy through the creation of the California Clean Energy Curriculum and Training Initiative of 2009. The author states that this model curriculum will be offered by high schools, technical schools, colleges, private institutions, and non-profit organizations to educate a new generation of workers pursuing careers in clean energy. However, AB 380 does not require the curriculum to be utilized by those institutions.

Fiscal Analysis: The bill states that the California Clean Energy Curriculum and Training Initiative is subject to funding by the Legislature, and not to exceed \$1 million. The funds for the initiative would be the result of a transfer of monies from the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Last year's AB 2224 (De La Torre) pursued similar interests and included similar funding provisions, and the bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee. The analysis stated that by requiring money collected by electrical corporations to be transferred to the State Treasury, the bill would impose a tax. Further, the PUC may not possess the authority to distribute funds to state departments, and the PUC cannot authorize state departments to expend the funds. AB 380 would require the PUC to identify funds and perform duties which would likely require the PUC to expend resources. This bill would also require the PUC to identify funds from the ratepayers served by Investor Owned Utilities (e.g., PG&E, SCE, SDG&E). However, all Californians would be affected by this bill, including those served by municipal owned utilities.

Organizations in Support:

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Latino Issues Forum (LIF)

Organizations in Opposition:

California Manufacturers and Technology Association (CMTA)

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
AB 552	Furutani	Community College Career Technical Education Financing	02/25/2009	Passed Asm Higher Ed. To Asm Appropriations
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
Support		4/15/09	Mike Magee	Econ Dev/Workforce

Summary: AB 552 would establish the Commission on Adequate Funding for Career Technical and Vocational Education at the California Community Colleges. The Commission would be required to conduct a study and make recommendations regarding financing alternatives for career technical education, vocational education, and high-cost laboratory programs at the California Community Colleges. The bill would require the commission to submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on or before July 1, 2011.

Background: According to the author, the existing financing structure for the California Community Colleges creates a financial disincentive to develop or continue existing career technical education, vocational education, and high-cost laboratory programs.

Policy Analysis: The author contends that there is variation in funding levels within region-specific industries and that high cost laboratory programs for career technical/vocational education are not funded adequately to address areas where there is a workforce shortage. The establishment of the commission composed of representatives from the California Community Colleges, industry, and state government will help identify solutions and by providing recommendations to the Legislature on financing alternatives for career technical education, vocational education, and for high-cost laboratory programs at the California Community Colleges.

Fiscal Analysis: In recognition of the state's fiscal condition, the author is seeking funding from foundations and private sources to support the Commission. The bill would authorize the Commission to collect and spend foundation funds and private donations, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the support of the commission. The author will also evaluate the potential for obtaining federal funds.

Organizations in Support:

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
California Federation of Teachers
California Teachers Association
Board of Governors, California Community Colleges

Organizations in Opposition: Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 48	Alquist	Textbooks	3/23/09	Senate Education 5/6/09
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend watch	4/13/09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary: SB 48 requires all textbook publishers to make any textbook sold at a public higher education institution available in electronic format with identical content, at equal or lesser price, by January 1, 2020.

Background: During the May 5, 2008, Board of Governors meeting, recommendations from the Textbook Summit were adopted as strategies to promote access and success through textbook affordability. Among the recommendations adopted was supporting the CSU sponsored Digital Marketplace. Although currently in the early design stages, once completed, the Digital Marketplace has the potential to significantly reduce the cost of textbooks and other learning materials.

Policy Analysis: While the author states that SB 48 will reduce educational costs its implementation date is 10 years away. Many textbook publishers are already providing their products in digital format which has yet to cause a significant cost reduction. Textbooks may be made available in electronic format earlier than 2020 as publishers adapt to a growing Internet-based market.

Fiscal Analysis: The fiscal impact of SB 48 is unknown at this time.

Organizations in Support:

Student Senate

Organizations in Opposition: Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 386	Runner	Textbooks: Justification New Editions	2/26/09	S-Ed. 4/29/09
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend Watch	4/10/09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary: SB 386 requires that the CSU and CCC faculty, if they have adopted a new textbook within three years of the previous adoption, to complete an analysis that contains the following:

- 1) A justification for changing the textbook.
- 2) A comparison of the differences between the new and old editions of the textbook.
- 3) Disclosure of any financial interest relating to the new textbook.

The analysis would be submitted to the Academic Senate, student government, and administration.

Background: In August of 2008, the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) released a report that contained research and recommendations on ways to reduce the cost of textbooks. Of the 23 textbooks reviewed by the BSA, they found that publishers released a new edition about every four years on average. Many of the deans, department chairs, and faculty members that were interviewed by the BSA stated that revisions to textbooks are minimal and are not always warranted.

Policy Analysis: The author states that students are subject to the arbitrary whims of their instructors. This new requirement on faculty may increase participation in other cost reduction strategies like adherence to adoption deadlines.

Some courses may require a new textbook every year. The analysis and justification alone may not accomplish anything other than highlight already identified problems and allow for students and advocates to easily criticize faculty members with which they disagree.

Fiscal Analysis: The fiscal impact of SB 386 is unknown at this time.

Organizations in Support:

Student Senate

Organizations in Opposition:

Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 361	Runner	Priority Enrollment for Veterans of Armed Forces.	2/25/09	Passed Sen. Veterans To Sen. Approps
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend: Support, if amended	4/13/09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary: SB 361 makes a change to existing Education Code that grants priority registration for former members of the Armed Forces in enrollment at California State University and the California Community Colleges. SB 361 limits priority enrollment for former members of the Armed Forces to those who were "honorably" discharged and extends the benefit to the National Guard.

Background: Existing law requires each of the public higher education segments that offer priority enrollment, to grant priority to any member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States if they enroll within two years of leaving active duty. The author states that a community college counselor from his district reported to his office that dishonorably discharged veterans are seeking priority registration.

Policy Analysis: The author's stated intent is to address a situation in which former members of the Armed Forces who were dishonorably discharged are able to take advantage of the priority registration benefit. SB 361 clarifies that students who are granted priority registration must have been "honorably" discharged. The bill also gives priority registration benefits to members of the National Guard and Reserve.

The Chancellor's Office staff proposed amendments to Senator Runner's office that were based on several comments from staff and advocates concerning outed gay soldiers and other special cases who may have received other than an "honorable" discharge. The proposed amendment would clarify that general discharge and other than honorable discharges be included and explicitly deny benefit to bad conduct and "dishonorable" discharges.

Consideration should also be given to how including the California National Guard, Naval Militia, and Reserves will affect the student registration process. Staff suggests working with the author on making the benefit applicable to members of the National Guard who served in overseas operations.

Fiscal Analysis: SB 361 may result in some relatively minor costs for each campus related to database adjustment.

Organizations in Support:
FACCC

Organizations in Opposition: Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 646	Denham	Veteran Tuition & Fee Waiver	2/27/09	S-ED 4/29/09 S-VA 7-0
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend Support	4/17/09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary: SB 646 would enact the Golden State GI Bill of Rights for Higher Education which would prohibit any campus of the University of California, the California State University, or the California Community Colleges from charging mandatory systemwide tuition or fees, including enrollment fees, or incidental fees to a California resident who is an undergraduate or graduate student and a honorably discharged military veteran.

Background: Current law prohibits public colleges and universities from charging mandatory systemwide tuition or fees to any:

- 1) Unremarried spouse or child (aged less than 27 years old but not necessarily a dependent) of a US military veteran who was killed in service or is permanently disabled.
- 2) Child (of any age) of a US military veteran, who has service-connected disability, was killed in service or who died of a service-connected disability and has an annual income below the national poverty level.
- 3) Members and dependents of the California National Guard, who was killed, died from a disability, or is permanently disabled while on active service.

Policy Analysis: SB 646 prohibits community colleges from charging any mandatory systemwide tuition or fees to any undergraduate student who is an honorably discharged veteran of the US Armed Forces who enlisted as a California resident; OR is or has been on active duty as a member of the California National Guard, the State Military Reserve or the Naval Militia; AND has participated in and used all of their federal education benefits. In addition, the number of semesters for which a fee waiver could be received would be limited to the number which the individual received under the federal Montgomery GI Bill (36 months full time). This bill would give awards to individuals irrespective of their income which may bring opposition.

Fiscal Analysis: The number of persons who would be eligible for the state benefit is unknown. For every 100 veterans or CNG members who obtain the benefit at the CCC, the annual revenue loss would be \$60,000, based on current fee levels.

Given that the GI Bill provides benefit for 36 months of instruction, or longer if unit load is less than 12 per semester, staff predicts a very low level of students would be eligible for this waiver at a community college.

Organizations in Support: FACCC

Organizations in Opposition: Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 815	Cogdill	Student Financial Aid: California National Guard	3/31/09	S-Ed. 4/29/09
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend Watch	4/13/09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary: SB 815 creates a state program to provide financial aid to members of the California National Guard, Naval Militia and Reserves. The aid would be awarded by the Adjutant General of the California National Guard and administrative support would be provided by the California Student Aid Commission.

Background: California is the only state that does not offer its National Guard educational assistance. In 2003, the Legislature enacted the NG-APPLE, which authorized 100 warrants in the budget of the Student Aid Commission, however the program was never adequately funded and sunset in 2007.

Policy Analysis: SB 815 would increase the number of California National Guardsmen able to afford a higher education in California. The bill includes a \$500 per semester award for books and supplies. This award is not need based. The bill does not specify if the award will be prorated with unit loads factored in.

This bill requires the student to take three units of instruction but payment is based on Cal Grant requirements that include a six unit load. There is also a question of coordination with college financial aid office. It is unclear how this program would interface with existing programs and policies.

Fiscal Analysis: This bill would have no known fiscal impact on the community college's administrative costs. SB 815 states that the program will become active when the Legislature appropriates \$3.6 million to the Military Department. In the current fiscal environment the Legislature is unlikely to fund the program in the near future.

Organizations in Support:
California National Guard (Sponsor)

Organizations in Opposition: Unknown at this time.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
AB 1569	VA Comm.	Postsecondary education: resident classification: veterans.	3/16/09	Asm H. Ed. 5/5/09
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
	Recommend support	4-17-09	Troy Carter	Student Services

Summary:

This bill would bring all state public higher education institutions into compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEA) provision that stipulates a public institution that receives institutional aid under the federal HEA must charge members of the Armed Forces and their dependants at the in-state tuition rates as long as those students are continuously enrolled.

Background:

Section 114 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 prohibits public institutions that receive HEA funds from charging the dependents of members of the Armed Forces on active duty for more than 30 days, whose domicile or permanent duty station is in the same state, more than in-state tuition rates.

Policy Analysis:

Higher education institutions including California's community colleges will not be eligible for institutional aid authorized by the federal Higher Education Act unless they offer members of the Armed Forces and their dependants the in-state tuition rates for as long as those students are continuously enrolled. AB 1569 would force compliance and thus make all of California's public higher education institutions pass this federal funding test. Staff have indicated that most, if not all colleges are already complying with this policy and may be written in Title V.

Fiscal Analysis: Unknown at this time.

Organizations in Support: None on file.

Organizations in Opposition: None on file.

**California Community Colleges
Government Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL No.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 217	Yee	Executive Compensation	As introduced, 02/23/09	Senate Education Committee
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
Oppose		April 15, 2009	Marlene Garcia	

Summary: This bill prohibits the CCC Board of Governors and the CSU Trustees from increasing the compensation for any executive officer in any year in which mandatory student fees are increased; the bill also requests the UC Regents to comply with this prohibition.

Background: The "mandatory enrollment fee" at the community colleges is set in statute by the Legislature (Sec. 76300(b)(1), Ed.C.). Neither the local CCC governing boards nor the BOG has the authority to set student fees. Statute requires local CCC districts to collect the fee as prescribed in statute.

Policy Analysis: The bill restricts any increases in compensation for executive officers of the CCCs, the CSU in any year when mandatory student fees are increased and requests that this prohibition apply to UC. For the community colleges, executive officers are defined as, including but not limited to, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, an executive vice chancellor, a senior vice chancellor, the general counsel of the colleges and an individual campus president.

Fiscal Analysis: Unclear

Comments: The bill penalizes the community colleges for actions taken by the Legislature to increase student fees even though the colleges do not have the authority to set fees. Further, the bill links executive compensation to student fee increases – a practice that could result in seeing the salaries of administrators and faculty employees who are not subject to these restrictions approach and potentially exceed the compensation of the executives targeted in this bill. The bill arbitrarily freezes the salaries of specified executives irrespective of what is in the best interest of the institution and maintaining a quality education program for students.

**California Community Colleges
Governmental Relations
2009-10 Legislative Bill Analysis**

BILL NO.	AUTHOR	SUBJECT	BILL VERSION (DATE)	STATUS/LOCATION
SB 248	Oropoza	Education Equity Act: Title IX	03/31/00	Senate Education: April 22, 2009
POSITION	POSITION STATUS	ANALYSIS VERSION (DATE)	GR STAFF	DIVISION LIAISON
		04/15/09	Mike Magee	

Summary: SB 248 requires the president chief executive officer of a community college campus, the president of a campus of the California State University, and all school districts to post the Athletes' Bill of Rights By July 1, 2010, on their own Web site. SB 248 requires that in addition to the Web site, the colleges in the district or university must post the Athletes' Bill of Rights on the entrance to the college or university gymnasiums and in the locker rooms, which are based on the relevant provisions of the federal regulations implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1681 et seq.). The Athletes' Bill of Rights are listed in SB 248 as the following:

- (1) You have the right to fair and equitable treatment and you shall not be discriminated against based on your sex.
- (2) You have the right to be provided with an equitable opportunity to participate in all academic extracurricular activities, including athletics.
- (3) You have the right to inquire of the athletic director of your school as to the athletic opportunities offered by the school.
- (4) You have the right to apply for athletic scholarships.
- (5) You have the right to receive equitable treatment and benefits in the provision of all of the following:
 - (A) Equipment and supplies.
 - (B) Scheduling of games and practices.
 - (C) Transportation and daily allowances.
 - (D) Access to tutoring.
 - (E) Coaching.
 - (F) Locker rooms.
 - (G) Practice and competitive facilities.
 - (H) Medical and training facilities and services.
 - (I) Publicity.
- (6) You have the right to have access to a gender equity coordinator to answer questions regarding gender equity laws.
- (7) You have the right to contact the State Department of Education and the California Interscholastic Federation to access information on gender equity laws.
- (8) You have the right to file a confidential discrimination complaint with the United States Office of Civil Rights or the State Department of Education if you believe you have been discriminated against or if you believe you have received unequal treatment on the basis of your sex.
- (9) You have the right to pursue civil remedies if you have been discriminated against.
- (10) You have the right to be protected against retaliation if you file a discrimination complaint.

Background: In recent years, there have been several high profile lawsuits against the CSU and the UC alleging gender discrimination. The author and its principal coauthor (Senator Florez) are pursuing legislation to address issues concerns stemming from the alleged discrimination.

Policy Analysis: SB 248 seeks to improve awareness of Title IX by requiring that information be posted prominently for students and parents.

Fiscal Analysis: By mandating that school districts and college campuses post information on Web sites and gymnasiums, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. Costs resulting from this measure are not yet available.

Organizations in Support:

California Athletic Trainer's Association

California Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance

ACLU

Organizations in Opposition:

No known opposition.