THE ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE UPCOMING CONSULTATION COUNCIL MEETING.

1. Chancellor’s Office Update
2. Student Senate Update
3. State and Federal Update
4. Intersegmental Transfer
5. California Community College System Support Program Analysis
6. Student Centered Funding Formula Implementation Update
7. Other
   a. Announcements from Consultation Council members

FUTURE 2020 MEETING DATES:

April 16, 2020
May 21, 2020
June 18, 2020
July 16, 2020
August 20, 2020
September 17, 2020
October 15, 2020
November 19, 2020 (CCLC Annual Convention in San Francisco, CA)
December 17, 2020
DIGEST ITEM 2: STUDENT SENATE UPDATE

“Digest” means an item has been through internal review by the Chancellor’s Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance and is officially “entered into Consultation.” The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Contact(s): Danny Thirakul, President, Student Senate for California Community Colleges (SSCCC)
Amine El Moznine, Vice President of Legislative Affairs, SSSCC

Issue
The Student Senate for California Community Colleges will provide the Consultation Council members with an update on the Student Senate for California Community Colleges’ (SSCCC) current initiatives, legislative stances, and system participation as well as the current status of the board.

Background
The SSCCC will present the council with an update on actions taken by the SSCCC Board of Directors (Board) since the previous Consultation Council meeting, as well as concerns raised by the Board and constituents, including, but not limited to, legislation and the state of the SSCCC.

• Student Senate Priorities
  ▪ Continued planning for the March in March and the 2020 General Assembly.
    ✷ March Tentative Presenters:
      • Assemblymember Medina
      • Assemblymember Berman
      • Assemblymember Weber
      • Senator Leyva
      • Chancellor Oakley
      • League, ASCCC, and FACCC
  ▪ Legislative Priorities
    ✷ SSCCC Sponsored Bills:
      • AB 2190 (Medina) – Board of Governors Member voting rights
      • AB 2910 (Weber) – Governor Board Membership – Student Member Voting Rights
SSCCC Supported Bills:
- AB 2388 (Berman) – Student Basic Needs
- AB 2884 (Berman) – Lottery allocation for community Colleges

Bills under consideration by the SSCCC:
- AB 2972 (Limón) – Undocumented Students training for administrators and staff
  - Working with constituents to clarify the roles of other organizations in student engagement and who represents the 2.4 million students.

Recent Events
- Participated in a California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Podcast on the SSCCC and the March in March.
- Continue to participate in the planning for the Pathways to Equity Conference.
- Participated in the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges Advocacy and Policy Conference March 8 – 9, 2020 in Sacramento.
- Testified before the California Student Aid Commission on Cal Grant Reform.

Feedback/Questions for Council
This item is presented to the Consultation Council for information and discussion.

Attachments:
1. SSCCC March Newsletter (https://bit.ly/2xBRMc5)
DIGEST ITEM 3: STATE AND FEDERAL UPDATE

“Digest” means an item has been through internal review by the Chancellor’s Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance and is officially “entered into Consultation.” The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Contact(s): Lizette Navarette, Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning

Issue
The Chancellor’s Office Division of Governmental Relations will provide Consultation Council with the State and Federal Update.

Background
California law (Ed Code § 70901(b)(4)) requires the Board to provide representation, advocacy and accountability for the system before state and national legislative and executive agencies. The Board Procedures and Standing Orders provide guidance to the Chancellor in representing the California Community Colleges on matters pending before the California Legislature and Governor, Congress, and the President. The Procedures and Standing Orders also authorize the Chancellor to take positions on pending legislation on behalf of the Board, as specified (Procedures and Standing Orders § 317).

The Governmental Relations division represents the Chancellor and the Board on state and federal policy and advocacy matters. The California Community Colleges Vision for Success, the 2020–21 Board of Governors Budget and Legislative Request, and 2020 Legislative Principles. The Governmental Relations division seeks feedback from the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors prior to taking positions on pending policy matters.

The attached documents provide additional details on current state and federal policy and advocacy matters:

State Legislative Update - provides an overview of recent state advocacy activities, summarizes the topic and status of a number of recently introduced high priority bills.

State Legislative Matrix - provides a comprehensive list of all state legislation identified by the Governmental Relations division affecting the Chancellor’s Office, California Community Colleges and/or California students.
**Analyses for Discussion:**
An analysis is provided on bills the Chancellor’s Office is reviewing. Two bills are included for information and discussion this month:

a) AB 3310 (Muratsuchi) Community colleges: ethnic studies.
b) AB 1862 (Santiago) California State University: tuition.

A discussion of ACA 5 (Weber), introduced on March 10, 2020, will also take place. No analysis is included in this item.

**Feedback/Questions for Council**
The Chancellor’s Office will seek feedback on any legislation proposed for support.

**Attachments:**
1. State Policy and Advocacy Update
2. California Community Colleges Legislative Bill Analysis – AB 3310
3. California Community Colleges Legislative Bill Analysis – AB 1862
4. Federal Policy and Advocacy Update
5. Legislative Matrix (handout will be provided at the meeting)
State Policy and Advocacy Update

Facilities Bond Elections
On March 3rd, a statewide election was held. On the ballot was Proposition 13, which would authorize $15 billion in general obligation bonds for school facilities construction. The $15 billion was divided among K-12 ($9 billion), California Community Colleges ($2 billion), California State University ($2 billion) and University of California ($2 billion). At the time this item was written, the measure was behind with only 45% of the vote in favor of it. However, due to changes to voting rules and revised vote casting option, many votes remained to be counted. Further, the vote certification process is 30-days long.

There were also eight local community college district (CCD) bonds totaling $4.3 billion. At the time this item was written, only two local bonds had enough votes to pass. All local bonds required 55% of votes for approval.

Approved
• City College of San Francisco: $845 million
• Foothill-De Anza CCD: $898 million

Still Counting Votes:
• Yuba CCD: $228 million
• Los Rios CCD: $650 million
• Cabrillo CCD: $274 million
• Riverside CCD: $715 million
• Merced CCD: $247 million
• Rancho Santiago CCD: $496 million

In addition, Foothill-De Anza’s $48 parcel tax failed. It required 66% of votes for approval.

Government Relations will continue to track these results during the 30-day canvassing period and report on the final results.

Update on Legislation
February 21st was the deadline to introduce legislation in the 2019-2020 session. This year, the State Assembly introduced 1,527 bills and the State Senate introduced 714 Senate bills. The Government Relations division has identified 238 bills, including 40 spot bills and several 2-year bills from 2019, that effect community colleges and higher education, including “spot bills” that contain no substantive language and will be amended as the session progresses. This approach gives legislators more time to work with stakeholders and sponsors of the bill before the measure is heard in policy committee. Bills cannot be heard in policy committee for at least 30 days and as a result most bills on community college matter are not permitted to be heard in policy committee until late March.
The section below provides an update on pending high priority bills. For details, visit the Legislative Counsel’s website (http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/). A full Legislative Matrix is available from Imran Majid (imajid@cccco.edu).

**Sponsored Legislation**

**SB 291 (Leyva) California Community College Financial Aid Program**
Would create a new financial aid program targeted to community college students, linked to the total cost of college and accounting for existing aid and student/family resources.

Status: Approved by the Senate (31-5) and pending in the Assembly Higher Education Committee.

**Supported/Opposed Legislation**

**AB 302 (Berman) Community Colleges Overnight Parking**
Position: Watch

Would require a community college campus that has parking facilities on campus to grant overnight access to those facilities to any homeless student who meets specified requirements. Colleges would be exempt from the requirement for facilities within 250 feet from an elementary school, or if they provide hotel vouchers, rapid rehousing or emergency aid to students. The Chancellor’s Office would be required to report on the implementation of the bill. The law would sunset in 2022.

Status: Approved by the Assembly Floor (60-8), Senate Education Committee (7-0) and Senate Judiciary Committee (7-1) and Senate Appropriations Committee (5-2). Currently held in the Senate Inactive File.

**AB 376 (Stone) Student Loan Servicing**
Position: Support

This bill would provide definitions for an abusive act and other terms and conditions; require the Department of Business Oversight (DBO) to monitor for risks to consumers in the provision of student loan servicing; and, require the Commissioner of Business Oversight to designate a Student Borrower Advocate to provide timely assistance to student loan borrowers and to receive and review complaints.

Status: Approved by the Assembly Floor (59-15), Senate Banking Committee (4-1), and Senate Judiciary Committee (7-1). Pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1343 (Eggman) California 85/15 Rule**
Position: Support

Would prohibit, beginning January 1, 2021, a private postsecondary educational institution from enrolling residents of California, unless the institution meets either the requirement that no more than 85% of the institution’s tuition revenue is derived from
student financial aid and loans, or not less than 50% of the institution’s revenue is dedicated to student instruction.

Status: Approved by the Assembly Floor (66-5). Pending in the Senate Business and Professions Committee at request of author. 2 Year-Bill.

**AB 2019 (Holden) College and Career Access Pathways partnerships: county offices of education**

Position: Support (pending Board of Governors approval)

This bill authorizes a county office of education (COE) to enter into College and Career Access Pathway (CCAP) partnership with a community college district.

Status: AB 2019 will be heard by the Assembly Higher Education Committee on March 17th.

**SB 860 (Holden) Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program: postsecondary education financial aid applications**

Position: Support (pending Board of Governors approval)

This bill clarifies the role of Foster Youth Services Coordinating Programs (FYSCPs) to include coordination of efforts to support Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) completion among foster youth who are high school seniors.

Status: SB 860 will be heard by the Senate Education Committee on March 25th.

**SB 958 (Leyva) Community colleges: Cooperating Agencies Foster Youth Educational Support Program (NextUp)**

Position: Support

This bill changes the eligibility criteria for the NextUp program to allow students in foster care after the age of 13 to participate and to align with eligibility for priority registration. It also allows colleges to use funds on enrolled NextUp students before their first day of class and allows colleges to prioritize students with lower incomes.

Status: SB 958 will be heard by the Senate Education Committee on March 25th.

**Advocates**

If you have not already subscribed to the Government Relations listserv, where information is routinely distributed, you are welcome to join. To subscribe, send an e-mail to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET and put SUBSCRIBE ADVOCATES in the body of a BLANK, NON-HTML e-mail. NO SUBJECT OR SIGNATURES.
California Community Colleges Legislative Bill Analysis

Bill Number:
Assembly Bill (AB) 3310: Community colleges: ethnic studies.

Author:
Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (D-Torrance)

Status:
Assembly Rules Committee

Bill Summary:
This bill would, commencing with the 2021–22 academic year, require each community college district to offer courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses, and commencing with the 2023-24 academic year, require the completion of at least one ethnic studies course as a requirement for an associate’s degree.

Bill Detail:
Specifically, this bill:

- Requires, commencing with the 2021-22 academic year, each community college district to offer courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses. The units earned by students for successful completion of these courses must be eligible for transfer to count toward a baccalaureate degree and, if applicable, shall meet the ethnic studies graduation requirements at the California State University (CSU). Each community college district shall collaborate with its academic senate in the development of these courses.

- Requires, commencing with the 2023–24 academic year, the completion of at least one three-unit course in ethnic studies as a requirement for an associate’s degree. A community college district shall not increase the number of units required to obtain an associate’s degree in order to implement this requirement.

- Requires the Chancellor to develop and adopt appropriate regulations for implementation.

Discussion:
This bill is similar to AB 1460 (Weber), which requires the CSU to provide ethnic studies courses at each of its campuses and makes ethnic studies an undergraduate graduation requirement. AB 1460 is currently pending on the Senate Floor.

By imposing a new graduation requirement, this bill could alter Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathways. Since the establishment of the ADT program, over 112,000 transfer pathways between CSU and California Community Colleges have been approved. In 2018-19, there were 1.1 million students who reported an educational goal of “obtain an associate degree and transfer to a four-year institution” or “obtain an associate's degree without transfer.”
**Fiscal Impact:**
This bill could pose costs between $26 million and $28 million for the California Community Colleges. To the extent AB 1460 is signed and implemented, costs could be lower, but include:

- $200,000 to review 40 ADT Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) templates for impact. Exact costs could vary depending on findings and the number of meetings held ($5,000 per ADT).
- For the TMCs that do require additional revisions due to the 60 unit threshold requirement, $10,000 per each ADT to correct these concerns (ranging from $0-$400,000).
- $570,000 for 114 college local curriculum committees to review ethnic studies course availability and make necessary adjustments ($5,000 per community college).
- $3.5 million for 40 community colleges without an ethnic studies course to develop ethnic studies curriculum, hire staff, and other start-up costs.
- $22.5 million to hire additional full-time and adjunct faculty across 114 colleges to meet student demand for ethnic studies courses. Over the past three years, California Community Colleges had an average of 72 full-time and 67 adjunct faculty who teach ethnic studies courses. To reach the level of faculty necessary to teach in other social, political, and economic offerings, community colleges would need to hire a minimum of 200 full-time and 250 adjunct faculty. However, it is likely community colleges will need additional faculty beyond these numbers.
- Unknown, but likely absorbable, costs for the following tasks:
  - Catalog updates, assist.org updates, advising sheet updates
  - Local college degree submissions for ADTs requiring restructuring
  - CCCCDO degree change submission processing

**Supporters:**
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)
California Community Colleges Legislative Bill Analysis

Bill Number:
Assembly Bill (AB) 1862 Public postsecondary education: California State University: tuition.
(Adds Section 89700.2 to the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.)

Author:
Assemblymember Miguel Santiago (D-53, Los Angeles)

Status:
Assembly Committee on Higher Education

Committee/Floor Votes:
Not applicable

Bill Summary:
This bill seeks to expand state financial aid opportunities for community college transfer students who received a California College Promise fee waiver or transferred to a campus of the California State University (CSU) with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), and enroll as fulltime students.

Bill Detail:
Specifically, this bill:

- Includes intent language stating that sufficient funding be allocated to each participating campus to offset the cost of all tuition and mandatory systemwide fee waivers.

- Prohibits a California State University from charging systemwide enrollment fees for any academic year, up to 2 academic years, to a California Community College transfer student who has satisfied either of the following: (1) the student has completed an associate degree for transfer; or (2) the student received a fee waiver under the California College Promise program.

- Upon appropriation by the Legislature, the chancellor shall distribute funding to each campus participating in the California Promise.

Discussion:
According to the author, recent economic projections indicate that California will be facing a shortage of over 1 million bachelor’s degree-holding workers by 2030. This shortage will create a workforce skills gap – a problem that cannot be addressed even by an influx of educated workers from other states or countries. The author believes the only viable option to avoid this economic disaster is for California to expand access to higher education institutions and graduate more students. To help meet this demand Assemblymember Santiago introduced AB 1862, which seeks to bring California closer to establishing debt free higher education and increase bachelor's degree holders in California.
This bill expands upon the state’s community college Promise fee waiver by creating a CSU version of the program. The California College Promise fee waiver is not dependent on a student's financial need. One of the key arguments for this bill is that it provides two years of tuition-free education at a CSU campus, which will significantly reduce financial burdens for students and allow them to focus on their studies and graduate faster.

Proposals similar to AB 1862 have prompted extensive debate across the nation on college access and affordability. Many community college districts throughout California and across the U.S. have implemented local Promise Programs. According to information from these programs they have expanded access to financial aid, promoted equity, increased enrollment, improved academic performances, and boosted college completion rates.

The community college California College Promise fee waiver was established by AB 19 (Santiago of 2017). It waives one academic year of the $46/unit California Community College (CCC) student fee for any first-time full-time student who completes and submits either a Free Application for Federal Student Financial Aid (FAFSA) or a California Dream Act application, and maintains a 2.0 GPA. The Promise fee waiver is awarded to students without any consideration of financial need. An eligible community college district must make the federal student loan program available to its students, partner with a high school for purposes of an early outreach program, participate with the Guided Pathways Grant Program, and maximize student access to need-based financial aid through the Board of Governors fee waiver. AB 2 (Santiago of 2019) expands the California College Promise fee waiver program by adding a second year to the program.

This bill establishes a CSU Promise fee waiver based on the following criteria: 1) a student completes a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) application, 2) a student meets enrollment requirements (i.e. transfer with an ADT, have a record of receiving the Promise grant while attending a community college, and full-time attendance at a CSU).

Traditionally, state financial aid has been based on financial need. AB 1862 would provide a two-year fee waiver without any determination of a CSU students' financial need.

Fiscal Impact:
Local Operations: No additional costs.
State Operations: No additional costs to the Chancellor’s Office. Increased cost pressures to the state General Fund.

Supporters:
Los Angeles Community College District (Sponsor)

GR Recommendation and Rationale:
Concern.

This bill would increase CSU financial aid only for transfer students with an ADT or those who received a California College Promise fee waiver. It is important to note that the majority of community college students enroll on a part-time basis, so they would not be eligible for the California College Promise fee waiver and by extension the CSU fee waiver. In addition, not all low-income community college students that transfer to CSU have an
ADT. Thus, AB 1682 does not provide the same financial aid opportunity for all low-income transfer students at CSU, nor does it target students with the greatest financial need.

In addition, Cal Grant reform is on the agenda for this legislative session and the associated costs will be a major consideration. Cal Grant reform has the potential to increase the number of financial aid awards for thousands more low-income community college students and would increase individual awards up to $6,000 per academic year. This bill could negatively impact current negotiations regarding Cal Grant reform by increasing overall state financial aid costs.
Federal Policy and Advocacy Update

Intersegmental Letter on 2020-21 Appropriations
In March, the Chancellor’s office in conjunction with California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) distributed a joint letter to the members of the Senate Education and Labor Committee thanking them for last year’s appropriations measures that supported minority-serving institutions and urging increased and sustained investments in several Department of Education programs for 2020-21. These requests include an increase in the maximum annual Pell grant award to at least $7,000, more robust funding for Federal Work Study, and additional investment to expand student eligibility for federal GEAR UP and TRIO programs, which provide critical outreach and support to underserved and low-income communities.

College Affordability Act
A comprehensive renewal of the Higher Education Act (HEA) that would increase the maximum Pell Grant awarded by $625, permanently restore the Pell Grant's automatic annual inflation adjustment, restore Pell eligibility for students in incarcerated education programs, and expand Pell eligibility to DACA recipients. Would establish a federal-state funding partnership, providing grants to states that waive community college tuition and fees through a $3 to $1 match. The CAA would further establish new accountability structures of for-profit higher education institutions by reinstating the gainful employment rule that would eliminate federal aid to programs if the debt-to-income ratio of graduates exceed a certain threshold in a three-year period.

Update
In October 2019, the CAA passed out of the House Ed and Labor Committee and is now awaiting to be taken up by the full House. Chairman Bobby Scott (D-VA) of the House Education and Labor Committee has indicated that he would like to have the bill on the House floor by no later than “late spring” of this year. In the Senate, Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Chairman of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions has said he is intending to have a bill to reauthorize the Higher Education Act pass out of committee by no later than the end of April. He is currently engaged in discussions and negotiations with Ranking Member Patty Murray (D-WA) on the provisions of a bill.
DIGEST ITEM 4: INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER

“Digest” means an item has been through internal review by the Chancellor’s Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance and is officially “entered into Consultation.” The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Contact(s): Marty Alvarado, Executive Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Support

Issue
Senate Bill (SB) 1440 was signed into law September 29, 2010. This new law aimed to increase the number of students who successfully transfer from the California Community Colleges (CCC) into the California State University (CSU) system by establishing the associate degree for transfer (ADT). While there has been significant growth in the number of CCCs offering programs with ADTs, as well in the number of both ADTs and traditional associate degrees, questions remain about the ability of CCC students to transfer.

This item provides an overview of the available transfer data and is intended to initiate a discussion on the supports and resources needed to strengthen seamless transfer options for CCC students.

Background
Since adoption of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education, the CCC have played a significant role in providing all the students of California access to a postsecondary education. While the CCC has the largest enrollment of any postsecondary system in the United States, CCC students ultimately seeking a bachelor’s degree have faced barriers moving from a community college to four-year institutions.

SB 1440 was passed in 2010 to improve the seamlessness of transfer between the CCC and CSU specifically, with a goal of addressing at least four key barriers. One, many transfer-seeking CCC students failed to matriculate into four-year bachelor’s degree programs. Two, among students who did transfer to a bachelor’s degree program, many did so after accumulating significantly more than 60 units. Three, students who transferred were often required to repeat lower division courses once arriving at the CSU. And four, students who successfully transferred often did so without earning an associate degree, effectively forfeiting the labor market value for completed coursework.
SB 1440 was designed to increase the rate of successful transfer by establishing a relatively defined set of similar community college courses system-wide that would be accepted as lower division coursework at all CSU campuses with a comparable degree program. Students who earned this associate degree for transfer (ADT) would then be guaranteed admission to the CSU system in that major with upper-class standing and be required to complete no more than 60 units of additional coursework to earn a bachelor's degree.

In 2017, Chancellor Oakley introduced the Vision for Success as a way to ensure that students from all backgrounds and regions of California succeed in reaching their goals. The purpose of SB 1440 coincides directly with three Vision for Success goals. Specifically, it serves as a mechanism to: ensure students who have earned an associate degree are awarded the credential as they transfer out of the CCC system (Goal 1), increase the percent of CCC students transferring to the CSU or UC (Goal 2), and decrease the average number of units accumulated by students earning associate degrees (Goal 3).

The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office subsequently adopted Guided Pathways as a key framework to implement the Vision for Success goals. In brief, the framework emphasizes systemic change oriented around removing known friction points along the student's educational journey. This includes better organizing and aligning the myriad of initiatives aimed at improving student success and shifting institutional practices that impede student progress. The guided pathways framework acknowledges that despite previous efforts to ensure successful transfer to the CSU and UC, including SB1440, students may continue to face a variety of systemic barriers. A brief review of progress to date is provided (see Attachment 1) in an effort to better understand and improve transfer experiences (as part of the Vision for Success and SB 1440).

Over the past 10-years, there has been a significant increase in the number of students earning associate degrees in the CCC. In 2009-2010, approximately 72,000 students earned at least one traditional associate degree (i.e., associate of arts or associate of science). By 2018-2019 the number had increased to more than 95,000; in the same year more than 54,000 students earned ADTs. In the last two years (i.e., between 2016-17 and 2018-19), the number of students earning ADTs and traditional associate degrees increased by more than 40% and 20%, respectively.

Prior to 2010 there were no ADT programs offered but by 2014-2015 there were nearly 1,200 (representing 18% of all associate degree programs). By 2018-2019 that number had increased to 2,247 representing 30% of all associate degree programs offered system wide.

Data from the CSU and UC indicate an increase in the number of students transferring to the CSU and the UC over the last ten years. Between fall 2010 and fall 2019, the number of CCC students transferring to the CSU increased from approximately 39,000 to nearly 55,000 (a 40% increase). During the same time, CCC transfer to the UC increased from 16,000 to just over 19,000 (a 22% increase).
Recent research suggests an improvement in the degree experience and efficiency of the ADT (Wheelhouse, 2018 – Attachment 2). According to that research, once departments introduce an ADT, students graduate with approximately 4.5 fewer units on average (or 1 to 1.5 fewer courses) and decrease time-to-bachelor’s degree by 1.6 terms, on average.

The data also suggest areas for further improvement and further exploration in at least a few areas (again, see Attachment 1). First, despite the dramatic increase in associate degree conferral, there has not been a concomitant increase in the number of CCC students applying to, enrolling in, or transferring to the CSU and UC.

Second, the forthcoming report, *The Truth about Transfer* (Attachment 3) written by the RP Group, indicates that CCC students continue to face challenges navigating transfer. Their analysis suggests three important issues for consideration. There appears to be a lost opportunity for the state of California given the large and increasing number CCC students completing associate degrees (traditional and ADT) without a parallel rise in the number of those students transferring to a CSU or UC.

The complexity of transfer is challenging for CCC graduates, and the amount of support available to them is not nearly commensurate to the need, particularly for first-generation students. The transfer process is unnecessarily complex, such that students are required to manage a process to determine what courses, taken in which years, taken at which campuses, count at which four-year institutions and in what pathway. This effectively means students must know where and for what purpose they want to transfer before they even begin taking community college courses, which likely results in them taking more courses than necessary. Managing these academic and administrative requirements appears to constrain students’ ability to matriculate into bachelor’s degree programs, even after completing the ADT or other associate degree. Attachment 4 may shed light on how poor alignment between high school math achievement and college math placement disadvantages STEM-aspiring students from reaping the benefits of SB 1440.

Finally, students are simultaneously required to understand and navigate the total cost of college as they transition from the CCC to a CSU or UC. Together, these challenges are daunting to students and leads many to forgo attempting transfer.

In sum, the system has realized exciting progress to improve transfer-readiness and ultimately provide a more efficient pathway for community college students seeking to transfer into bachelor’s degree programs. This snapshot of data suggests that the *Vision for Success* and guided pathways framework have been able to provide additional momentum to SB 1440, but there is more work needed to best support all of our students.

**Feedback/Questions for Council**
This item is presented to the Consultation Council for information and discussion.

**Attachments:**
1. Data on Associate Degree Completion and CCC Transfer to the CSU and the UC
2. **Associate Degrees for Transfer: A Snapshot of Progress in California Community Colleges**

3. **The Truth about Transfer: What Community College Students Say They Need to Get Through the Gate** is a forthcoming report from the [RP Group](https://rpgroup.org/through-the-gate) scheduled for release March 23, 2020

4. **Starting Off on the Wrong Foot: Math Misalignment and STEM Outcomes in the California Community Colleges**
Data on Associate Degree Completion and California Community Colleges Transfer to the California State University and the University of California

The data and summaries below provide a snapshot of intersegmental transfer between the California Community Colleges (CCC) public four-year partners, the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC).

Table 1 below demonstrates that there has been a significant increase in the number of students earning associate degrees in the CCC, even with the introduction of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT). In 2009-2010, approximately 72,000 students earned at least one traditional associate degree (i.e., associate of arts or associate of science degree). By 2018-2019, that number increased slightly to more than 95,000; but in the same year nearly 54,000 students earned ADTs. Over the last two years (i.e., between 2016-2017 and 2018-2019), the number of students earning ADTs and traditional associate degrees increased by approximately 40% and 20%, respectively.

Table 1: CCC Students Who Earned Associate Degrees by Type, 2009-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Associate of Arts or Associate of Science</th>
<th>Associate Degree for Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>72,277</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>70,506</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>72,078</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>76,360</td>
<td>5,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>78,144</td>
<td>11,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>76,868</td>
<td>20,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>79,254</td>
<td>30,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>79,474</td>
<td>37,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>85,730</td>
<td>46,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>95,375</td>
<td>54,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chancellor’s Office Management Information System (COMIS).

Note: The ADT was effectively established in the 2012-2013 academic year, so prior ADT completions are not applicable. For students with multiple awards, they are only counted once per academic year and type of award.
Table 2 below presents a summary of new undergraduate transfer applications to the CSU between 2010 and 2019. The number of new transfer applications from CCC students received at the CSU was relatively stable, increasing from 92,203 to 102,155 (an 11% increase). Since 2012, when the ADT was introduced, the CSU transfer admission rate for CCC students increased from 76% to 87%, though the bulk of that increase was in the last year. During the same period, the enrollment rate of CCC graduates into the CSU increased from 47% to 54%.

Table 2: New Transfer Applications, Enrollment, and Matriculation to the CSU, 2011-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Admission Rate</th>
<th>Enrollment Rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>92,203</td>
<td>61,096</td>
<td>39,143</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>88,851</td>
<td>62,510</td>
<td>37,911</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>88,720</td>
<td>67,610</td>
<td>41,215</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>104,048</td>
<td>79,906</td>
<td>48,697</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>101,575</td>
<td>76,839</td>
<td>47,418</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100,966</td>
<td>78,455</td>
<td>47,966</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>103,306</td>
<td>82,197</td>
<td>49,737</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>104,721</td>
<td>82,514</td>
<td>49,910</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>97,467</td>
<td>77,223</td>
<td>49,859</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>102,155</td>
<td>88,574</td>
<td>54,839</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSU Data System, Institutional Research & Analyses Dashboard.

Note: This table includes all new CCC applications, including those who did and did not receive an associate degree prior to transfer.

**CSU Transfer With and Without a Degree**

As seen in Figure 1 (below), from 2001 and 2012, between 80% and 90% of fall transfers to the CSU left the community college without a degree. However, starting in 2013 this began to decline such that in fall 2019 only 45% of fall transfers had not earned a degree before starting a bachelor’s degree program.
Among ADT holders, students can transfer with a guaranteed pathway, or not. The guaranteed pathway represents curricular alignment between the CCC and CSU that helps minimize time-to-bachelor’s degree. Between 2012 and 2019, the proportion of students transferring with an ADT in a guaranteed pathway increased from less than 1% to 24%. During that same period, the proportion of CCC students transferring to a CSU without a degree dropped from 81% to 45%.

The data available does not capture why students choose to transfer in or outside of a guaranteed pathway; however, this is potentially relevant to the analysis in Attachment 4, the Wheelhouse report, *Starting Off on the Wrong Foot*. That brief examines the relationship between high school math grade point average (GPA) and math course-taking in comparison to community college math placement among STEM-aspiring students. The first key finding was that more than half of STEM-aspiring students who earned at least a 3.4 GPA or took calculus were placed into developmental math courses. The second key finding was that STEM-aspiring students that were placed into transfer level-math earned 7 to 14 more transferrable STEM units compared to their peers placed in lower-level community college math courses.

**Figure 1: New Fall Undergraduate Transfers from CCC to CSU**

![Figure 1: New Fall Undergraduate Transfers from CCC to CSU](source=CSU Data Center, Institutional Research & Analyses Dashboard)
Table 3 below presents a summary of new undergraduate transfer applications to the UC between 2010 and 2019. The number of new transfer applications received at the UC increased from 28,287 to 35,280 (a 24.7% increase). Since 2012 when the ADT was introduced, the admission rate of CCC transfers to the UC increased from 69% to 75%, though this remains below the admission rate in 2010; the enrollment rate of CCC graduates into the UC increased from approximately 52% to 54%, though that remains below recent highs and the 55% rate in 2010.

Table 3: New Transfer Applicants, Enrollment, and Matriculation to the UC, 2010-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Admission Rate</th>
<th>Enrolled Rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28,287</td>
<td>22,157</td>
<td>15,572</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,885</td>
<td>20,992</td>
<td>15,848</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29,136</td>
<td>20,221</td>
<td>15,236</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29,208</td>
<td>20,309</td>
<td>15,511</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>20,346</td>
<td>15,654</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29,630</td>
<td>20,532</td>
<td>15,657</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>33,083</td>
<td>23,615</td>
<td>18,132</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32,259</td>
<td>24,393</td>
<td>18,703</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34,933</td>
<td>26,319</td>
<td>19,738</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>35,280</td>
<td>26,470</td>
<td>19,066</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Information Center.

Note: This table includes all new CCC applications, including those who did and did not receive an associate degree prior to transfer.
DIGEST ITEM 5: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM SUPPORT PROGRAM ANALYSIS

“Digest” means an item has been through internal review by the Chancellor’s Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance and is officially “entered into Consultation.” The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Contact(s): Lizette Navarette, Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning

Issue
The Governor’s 2020-21 proposes budget bill and trailer bill language to consolidate $125 million in funding from existing categorical set-asides and statewide programs to a new California Community College (CCC) System Support Program. This item provides an analysis of the proposed System Support Program.

Background
The Chancellor’s Office is required by statute to support several statewide support and accountability activities for the California Community Colleges, including:

- Statewide and regional professional development training
- Systemwide technology services
- Oversight and evaluation for certain categorical programs
- Statewide outreach campaigns supporting student recruitment
- Technical assistance for colleges and districts

Currently, the state funds many of these statewide activities through direct local assistance appropriations or through set-asides in various categorical programs. In general, those funds are administered through contracts and grants between the Board of Governors and particular community college districts. Those districts often use a percentage of the set-asides for their own administrative costs associated with these services. Further, the Chancellor’s Office administers several programs that are for statewide purposes—often with goals that are similar to the goals of the set-asides. Since programs were established independently of each other and at different times, they lack consistency in administration and fiscal oversight methods, and are not always well aligned with current district needs or the Vision for Success goals and local district goals.
The Governor’s proposal addresses this concern by establishing the new program. Specifically, the new program would integrate all or a portion of existing budgetary set-asides for administrative and statewide activities from certain programs. Programs incorporated into the proposed System Support Program will not see a decrease in funding. Account coding is the only change these programs will see. The trailer bill language consolidates $125 million from the following statewide and categorical set-asides into the proposed System Support Program:

- Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEA)
- Cooperating Agencies for Foster Youth (CAFYES)
- CCC Strong Workforce Program
- Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)
- Integrated Technology
- Transfer Education and Articulation
- Expand Delivery of Courses through Technology
- Statewide outreach campaigns related to affordability, transfer, and outreach to non-English speaking/bilingual households

The following programs will benefit from this streamlined structure. As proposed, these programs will not see a shift in their funding. Instead, these programs may benefit from statewide activities provided by the System Support Program, while retaining their set-aside funding, including any unused set-aside funding previously allocated for support of local activities:

- Extended Opportunity Programs & Services (EOPS)
- Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)
- Nursing Education Program

Trailer bill language would require the Board of Governors to annually adopt a budget for the new program and report on expenditures for the prior fiscal year. The System Support Program should result in savings from economies of scale and the elimination of duplicated administrative fees. Initially, many statewide contracts and grants would remain in place, and would undergo review for possible improvements as contracts and grants approach renewal.

**Feedback/Questions for Council**
This item is presented to the Consultation Council for information and discussion. Specifically, the Consultation Council could consider how this proposal would result in greater coordination and leveraging of the system’s purchasing power? And how this proposal would increase transparency of set-aside expenditures?

**Attachments:**
None.
DIGEST ITEM 6: STUDENT CENTERED FUNDING FORMULA
IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

“Digest” means an item has been through internal review by the Chancellor’s Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance and is officially “entered into Consultation.” The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Contact(s): Lizette Navarette, Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning

Issue
The Consultation Council will receive an update on implementation of the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) and recent apportionment reports.

Background
The SCFF consists of three components: the base allocation, the supplemental allocation, and the student success allocation. The SCFF funds districts using a base allocation tied to enrollment, a supplemental allocation based on student demographics correlated with higher need students, and a student success allocation based on outcomes.

Generally, the Chancellor’s Office releases apportionment memos three times per year:
• First Principal (P1) and Recalculation (R1) – February
• Second Principal (P2) Apportionment – June
• Advance Principal Apportionment – July

On February 25, the Chancellor’s Office releases the 2018-19 R1 and 2019-20 P1 apportionment calculations for the SCFF and various categorical programs. A copy of the 2018-19 R1 and 2019-20 P1 Apportionment Calculations memorandum is attached. Associated exhibits are available on the Chancellor’s Office website.

Local Property Tax Estimates
The 2019-20 P1 Apportionment Calculations include a deficit factor primarily attributed to local property tax estimates. Prior year data and trends indicate that P1 revenues have historically been reported lower by counties and districts at this point in time. Further, depending on the magnitude of the variance, the Governor and Legislature have backfilled offsetting revenue shortfalls with additional General Fund dollars.
Challenges with revenue estimates are a long-standing issue for California Community Colleges and the Chancellor’s Office which they have attempted to resolve through discussions with the Governor and Legislature. Unlike K-12 education, there is no provision for automatic backfill to protect community colleges from variances in revenue estimates. We will continue to work with the Governor and the Legislature to seek an automatic adjustment to General Fund revenues to offset any misaligned estimates used in the budget process to provide improved funding predictability for our system.

**Stability Protections**
The February 25 memorandum explained that beginning in 2020-21, the SCFF will provide stability protection based on a district’s year-over-year TCR changes rather than FTES changes only.

**Implementation**
The Chancellor’s Office is focused on implementation of the SCFF, with particular attention to feedback and recommendation shared by system stakeholders. Efforts will be concentrated on finalizing the SCFF rates by the P2 apportionment to enable multi-year simulations and professional learning opportunities. Additionally, in anticipation of the potential inclusion of first-generation student counts in the SCFF, the Chancellor’s Office will craft a plan and timeline for the consistent collection of first-generation student counts across all districts/colleges.

**Future Updates**
The Chancellor’s Office held a *Fiscal & Policy Update* on February 26, 2020. The *Fiscal & Policy Update*, a bi-monthly webinar series by the College Finance and Facilities Planning Division, will be held on the last Wednesday every other month from 11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. The next webinar is scheduled for April 29, 2020. During the months when a webinar is not scheduled, look for the *Fiscal & Policy Newsletter* in your inbox where districts and stakeholders will receive the latest updates. Memorandums, updates, and the webinar schedule and can be found on the [Chancellor’s Office webpage](https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/College-Finance-and-Facilities-Planning/Fiscal-and-Policy-Updates) and the [Vision Resource Center](https://visionresourcecenter.cccco.edu/).

**Feedback/Questions for Council**
This item is presented to the Consultation Council for information and discussion.

**Attachments:**

1. [The 2018-19 Recalculation (R1) and 2019-20 First Principal (P1) Apportionment Calculations Memorandum](https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/College-Finance-and-Facilities/MPDF/2019-2020/R1_P1_ApportionmentCalculationsMemo.pdf)