

**Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
Draft Legislative Proposal
2010
Subject: Centralized Assessment Delivery (CCCAssess)**

Issue: The following are perceived as issues related to testing and assessment in the California Community College (CCC) system:

- There are too many different testing instruments used statewide in math, English, and English as a Second Language (ESL)
- Institutions have different test scores and cut scores and some do not accept scores from other institutions.
- There is no capture or delivery of non-CCC delivered testing instruments (K-12 tests, STAR, CST, CAHSEE, EAP) or highest/last levels of courses taken in K-12 available to the CCC.
- Some colleges minimize the number of assessments given because of limited funding since the colleges are charged per assessment.
- Institutions do not receive a systemwide cost break because the tests are purchased locally and not in a consortium.

Policy Solutions: The proposed solution to the problem is to create a centralized storage and delivery data warehouse of CCC Assessment instruments, test scores, and other data used in the assessment/placement process:

- CCC creates a centralized assessment website that hosts a centralized set of test instruments and, upon request, delivers them via the web to local campus assessment labs.
- Centralized service negotiates a master purchased "enterprise" license of a fixed number of testing instruments for each curricular area to be assessed (math/Eng/ESL) to drive down costs; tests are centrally delivered.
- All costs of central delivery to be borne by a set-aside pot of Prop 98 funds (out of the TTIP fund) and not charged locally. For example, all existing local matriculation monies now used on testing instruments are kept locally and may be redirected to counseling or other matriculation services. Colleges are thus incentivized to provide the maximal number of assessments to students, including testing all students if they so choose.
- Colleges are not required to participate in this service and may still elect to use locally purchased testing instruments, but costs of these will be borne locally and not centrally. The goal would be to incentivize, but not require use of a central set of assessments.

- Central data repository builds private/password protected assessment web application that allows counselors to call up test data from CCC exams and all other K-12 testing information to provide multiple measures for placement. CCCTran is used to extract K-12 electronic transcript data “on the fly” to identify math/Eng/ESL courses taken in high school to add to the elements used for assessment/placement.
- Central data repository builds student “pre-test” application, delivered publicly over the web to prospective students. The student takes branched online assessment and gets preliminary placement information before they take actual test at campus. This enables the student to “study” for the test, and should allow for higher placement, which usually results in fewer levels of remediation to occur, and thus greater student success.

Outcomes/Benefits: The proposed CCCAssess solution solves these issues in a way that has been successful in other technology projects. By creating a centralized delivery of test instruments, and by funding this with a central, dedicated annual categorical funding amount (and not paid for locally), CCCAssess has the potential to create a “win-win” scenario that benefits all parties involved:

- The system would determine which testing instruments it desires to run centrally, and could then leverage its purchasing power to negotiate a much lower per unit test cost (perhaps up to even 50% of current prices); ultimately the State would save millions of dollars annually and it would greatly reduce the number and variety of assessments currently in use (but could greatly increase the volume of tests given).
- A centralized funding stream changes the incentive away from reducing the number of tests given to one where colleges are free to test as often as it wants to as there would be no local cost effect.
- Colleges would not be mandated to adopt the centralized assessment model, and still could choose to retain their own assessment instruments; however, the burden of cost for this would be borne locally. Having a “free” test provided centrally is a strong economic incentive to colleges. Monies not spent on testing are then freed up locally for other repurposing, such as counseling.
- Students would encounter the same assessment instrument regardless of location. If they had previously taken a test in a curricular area, that prior assessment would still be valid and portable for placement at another campus.

Fiscal Impact: There will be a cost for the development of the CCCAssess system. However, this system will result in greater cost savings to the colleges, and ultimately to the State.

Follow-Up/Discussion:

- We will continue the dialogue for this proposal.
- There appears to be strong interest.
- There are some questions on how this program will be funded.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
Draft Legislative Proposal
2010
Subject: Reduce Reporting Requirements

Issue: Statutory and Budget Act provisions require the Chancellor's Office to submit dozens of reports to the administration and the state Legislature. Some report requirements (i.e., content and deadlines) are burdensome, inconsistent, and/or duplicative (same report required in different parts of the Education Code), some reports can be consolidated or moved to a more efficient timeline, and some reports are no longer needed.

Currently, the Education Code and the Budget Act require the Chancellor's Office to produce a total of 43 reports (as of 10/13/09).

Of these reports:

- 27 are annual (of those, 2 reports could be made biennial)
- 4 need to be streamlined/consolidated
- 5 are obsolete (outdated requirement)
- 2 are submitted as needed
- 5 are one-time reports

Policy Solutions: We propose to develop legislative language that would allow us to streamline current reports, remove obsolete requirements from statute, and consolidate reports that address similar policy issues.

Of the 43 reports mentioned above, we recommend legislation that:

- Makes 2 annual reports biennial
- Deletes 5 reports
- Streamlines/Consolidates 4 reports

Outcomes/Benefits: Reducing these reporting requirements will result in improved efficiencies for the Chancellor's Office. This will allow our limited staff resources to be more efficient to produce legislative reports that help inform effective state policy decisions, and can be used on program activities at the Chancellor's Office and at the colleges. Also, reduced production, distribution, and printing costs could result in more savings to the state.

Follow-up: The committee wanted to see which reports we plan to change (information is attached).

Recommendations for Legislative Reports (Revised 10/13/09)

REPORT	AUTHORITY /SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	REASON CHANGE IS RECOMMENDED	RECOMMENDATION
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS				
COLLEGE FINANCE AND FACILITIES				
1	Education Code, Section 66725.3	Requires a one-time report to the Legislature on a common course numbering system by June 30, 2006	Delete because of the one-time status.	Delete
2	EC Section 1330	Report on the number of covered employees in an unemployment insurance management system for an apportionment of School Employees Funds by November 30 of each year	Delete because we do not have any "School Employees Funds."	Delete
3	EC Section 71051	EC requires a process to be developed for collaborative facilities. Leg Counsel's agency reports website indicates report requirement originating in 1998.	Delete because we already have a collaborative process in place.	Delete
STUDENT SERVICES				
4	EC Section 69655	Report on the number of EOPS students served and the number of EOPS students that achieve their educational goals.	Request to make this a biennial report to help reduce costs in CO.	Make biennial
5	ABX4.1 (Evans) 6870, provision 11(5)	Report on the distribution of funds, uses of funds, strategies to reach students, and info on the increase of students accessing financial aid.	Consolidate with report below. In AB4X 1 for 2010, due April 1, 2010	Consolidate with report below (#6)
6	ABX4.1 (Evans) 6870, provision 11(6)	Impact on outreach efforts for student headcount and FTES enrollment for 2006-07 and 2007-08	Consolidate with report above. In AB4X 1 for 2010, due May 15, 2010.	Consolidate with report above (#5)
7	ABX4.1 (Evans) 6870, provision 13	Report on the enrollment of new CalWorks students; why additional classes are needed to accommodate new students; and expenditure plan for the balance of funds.	Request to make this a biennial report to help reduce costs in CO.	Make biennial
8	EC Section 89343	Current statute states that CSU & CCCC need to evaluate this program, but does not specify the frequency or due date.	Delete because there is no report required.	Delete

Recommendations for Legislative Reports (Revised 10/13/09)

REPORT	AUTHORITY /SOURCE	DESCRIPTION	REASON CHANGE IS RECOMMENDED	RECOMMENDATION
TECHNOLOGY, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS				
9	EC Section 48800	Report on the number of students who enroll in CC summer courses and receive a passing grade.	Consolidate with other Concurrent Enrollment report.	Consolidate with report below (#10)
10	EC Section 76002	Report on the amount of FTES claimed for concurrent enrollment students for: noncredit; non-degree applicable courses; degree-applicable courses, excluding PE; and degree-applicable courses with PE.	Consolidate with other Concurrent Enrollment report.	Consolidate with report above (#9)
11	EC Section 10700-10710 (AB 1319, 2006)	Report on the feasibility, design, and cost of a common data set in adult education.	Delete because this was a one-time report.	Delete

**Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
Draft Legislative Proposal
2010
Subject: Federal Earmark for Veterans**

Issue: California leads the nation with 2.2 million veterans residing in state. The California Community College (CCC) system currently has close to 24,000 students using veteran education benefits, plus an estimated 8,000 active duty personnel enrolled annually, not including dependents. The California Postsecondary Commission projects a possible enrollment increase during the next year of 34,000 veterans and active duty personnel in private and public colleges and universities, with the greatest increase at community colleges.

Policy Solutions: The Chancellor's Office will pursue a statewide federal veteran's earmark. To help community colleges with high numbers of veterans address the unique needs of this growing student population, the funds from the earmark will be awarded on a competitive basis to colleges that submit a grant to the Chancellor's Office that addresses some or all of the following criteria:

- Serve a large number of returning veteran students and can demonstrate a commitment and capacity to develop a comprehensive veteran's educational service program.
- Have plans to develop the expertise and understanding of the unique academic support needs of returning veterans and would facilitate sensitivity training for community college faculty, staff and administrators about these needs.
- Tap public and private higher education in California to help leverage existing educational resources and programs for the benefit of student veterans, and facilitate development of new programs.
- Serve the community college as the resource expert in all services and benefits available to student veterans that can help them succeed academically. Some of these services include: (1) anger management classes and counseling, (2) work study opportunities, (3) mental health services, (4) rehabilitation services, (5) scholarship opportunities, (6) housing services, (7) disability services, (8) peer support, (9) tutoring services, and (10) understanding Montgomery GI Bill benefits and requirements;
- Work within the community to understand and coordinate all services and support that are available to student veterans through local Employment Development Department (EDD) offices, One-Stops, VA hospitals, non-profits, the VFW, local employers and other colleges and universities within the region.
- Help their college replicate effective veteran practices that have been developed and implemented at other community colleges in California, such as the Troops to Engineers Program (a partnership between Long Beach City College, CSU Long Beach and Boeing).

Fund one statewide Community College Veterans Coordinator at the CCC Chancellor's Office to help administer and support this program, and to provide resources to other colleges not funded for a local Veterans Coordinator.

Funding Request: Seek \$3.5 million to fund one systemwide veteran's coordinator in the Chancellor's Office and distribute competitive grants to colleges with the largest number of student veterans and the most strategic use of funding.

Outcomes/Benefits:

1. Receive federal funds for statewide veterans' initiative.
2. Use funds to improve educational opportunities for veterans at the local level and/or regional level.

Follow-up: We will develop a strategy for a viable proposal.