The California budget cycle begins with the Department of Finance (DOF) soliciting input from various state departments including Departments of Education, Health, Transportation, and others. After consultation with the DOF, the governor submits a proposed budget to the legislature based on tax revenue projections for the upcoming fiscal year. The California Constitution requires the governor to propose a budget by January 10.
The State of California’s primary source of revenue is personal income taxes, a volatile and unpredictable source. Proposition 98 requires minimum annual funding levels for K-12 and community colleges determined by a complex formula of monies from the state general fund and local property taxes. The K-12 and California Community Colleges share funds, and often one system is requesting a greater share of Prop 98 monies. Prop 98 regulations state that the community colleges should receive 10.93% of funding, but this statement is only a guideline for the legislature and not always honored.

For Community colleges, on-going funding remains in the system from year-to-year. To minimize the possibility of future budget cuts, the governor often proposes one-time funded initiatives in lieu of increases to base funding. Governor Brown has been cautious with increases in the budget, choosing to build state reserves to prepare for future needs in emergencies or falling revenues from economic downturns.

Constitutionally, the legislature must pass a budget by June 15, and until then the process of developing the budget continues. After the governor releases his proposed budget in January, the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), independent of the DOF, provides nonpartisan analysis and recommendations for changes to the governor’s budget plan. By mid-February, the LAO publishes a detailed report and recommendations for the governor’s proposed budget. Often, the LAO reports will differ from those of the DOF and will estimate projected state revenues as higher or lower.

In late February, budget hearings commence in subcommittees in both houses of the legislature. Subcommittees hear testimony from the DOF, LAO, state departments, partisan consultants, lobbyists, unions, and members of the public. These attempts to influence and shape the budget continue as personal income taxes are due in mid-April. Through the spring, the DOF proposes adjustments to the governor’s proposed budget, which informs the governor’s May revision of his original proposal, com-
monly known as the May Revise. Typically, the legislative budget committees wait for the May Revise before making their final recommendations to the full house.

After the May Revise, each house of the legislature attempts to pass a budget proposal by simple majority vote, and these proposals often differ. A Budget Conference Committee will attempt to reach a compromise between the assembly and senate proposals for the budget. Sometimes the governor, the speaker of the assembly, the senate president pro tempore, and minority leaders of the senate and the assembly will meet to work out a compromise if the Budget Conference Committee fails to do so.

The final budget package requires a simple majority vote of both houses and the governor's signature. The governor may reduce or eliminate any appropriations through a line-item veto. The final budget package also includes budget trailer bills or changes to the state budget that require changes to existing law. The California Constitution requires a balanced budget in which proposed expenditures do not exceed projected revenues for the ensuing fiscal year. The budget must be finalized by June 15 and applies from July 1 through June 30 of the following year.

RESOURCES:

Department of Finance: http://www.dof.ca.gov/budget/Budget_Process/index.html

Legislative Analysis Office: http://www.lao.ca.gov/
The 2017-18 Governor’s Budget released in January is good news for community college students. It proposes an increase in the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee of $2.1 billion (3%) over the revised 2016-17 level. This growth in the minimum guarantee would increase Proposition 98 funding for California Community Colleges (CCC) by $179 million (2.2%), raising total Proposition 98 funding to $8.4 billion. In February, the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) issued its analysis of the 2017-18 Governor’s
Budget and predicted that the 2017-18 Proposition 98 minimum guarantee is likely to be higher by May, which would result in an even greater funding increase for the CCCs.

Below is a summary of significant augmentations for the CCC budget as well as the LAO’s recommendations for consideration by the legislature.

**EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

- **$150 million for Implementation of Guided Pathways.** This initiative is intended to develop cohesive, integrated pathways to help more students achieve their educational objectives. The LAO recommends that the governor’s administration and the Chancellor’s Office provide additional information in hearings about the following issues: (1) how the proposed $150 million guided pathways program would be structured, implemented, and led; (2) what changes might be needed in the way the state organizes and funds CCC student success efforts; and (3) the rationale for the proposed funding amount and timeline. With this information, the legislature would be in a better position to weigh the proposal against other priorities.

- **$20 million for an Innovation Awards Program.** The Chancellor’s Office would have broad authority to select the focus of grants and awardees. The LAO recommends rejection of this proposal. The legislature could instead target the funding to other priorities, like deferred maintenance, that are one-time in nature.

**APPORTIONMENTS**

- **$94 million for a 1.48% Cost-Of-Living Adjustment (COLA).** The LAO recommends waiting until early May for updated estimates of 2016-17 enrollment and then adjusting apportionments for that year and 2017-18 accordingly. Regardless, the LAO recommends approval of a COLA.
• **$79 million to Fund 1.34% Enrollment Growth.** The LAO recommends that the legislature continue to monitor CCC course offerings to ensure colleges do not unduly expand enrollment in non-priority areas to meet enrollment targets.

• **$24 million for a Base Increase.** Funds would cover increasing operating costs such as employer pensions. The LAO recommends approval of the increase and consideration of a larger increase if additional state revenue is available in May.

**TECHNOLOGY**

• **$10 million for the Online Education Initiative.** These funds would purchase a learning management system provided free to colleges. The LAO recommends rejection of this augmentation that would permanently and fully subsidize a statewide course management system. The existing subsidy already enables most colleges to realize significant savings from adopting the new software.

• **$6 million for an Integrated Library System (ILS).** An ILS would allow every student to access a cloud-based, up-to-date library catalog. The LAO believes implementing an ILS would be an effective use of one-time funds due to the likelihood of it resulting in better and more consistent services for students and faculty across the system. The LAO recommends that the CCCs move forward with procuring an ILS whether or not the state provides specific funding for it.

**CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE**

• **Two Additional Exempt Vice Chancellor Positions.** The additional positions would assist the Chancellor’s Office’s efforts to improve student success, address disparities in outcomes for disadvantaged groups, and develop the proposed guided pathways program. The LAO recommends that the administration and Chancellor’s Office report on the results of their organizational review during spring budget hear-
ings. At that time, the Chancellor’s Office might offer better justification for any proposal to add positions or funding and identify lower-value oversight activities that could be curtailed without adverse effect.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

- *Capital Outlay Projects.* While the Board of Governors approved 29 projects for funding in 2017-18, the Governor’s Budget only includes $7.4 million for initial planning costs for five Proposition 51 bond-funded projects. The governor focused on projects addressing critical health and safety needs as well as improving existing instructional infrastructure. The total state costs for the five projects, including construction, are estimated to be at $182 million. The LAO recommends that during spring budget hearings the administration clarify its plans for allocating the $2 billion in Proposition 51 bond funding for CCC facility projects as expeditiously as possible. Based on the information provided, the LAO recommends that the administration consider authorizing additional CCC projects in 2017-18 and developing a five-year expenditure plan.

The next steps in the budget process are legislative hearings in both houses and receiving input from stakeholders, which will provide the administration with valuable input when developing the May Revision.

For more information about any of the LAO’s recommendations, please see the below links:

Laura N. Metune joined the Chancellor’s Office in December as the Vice Chancellor for External Relations. Her division of the Chancellor’s Office serves as an advocate for the community college system and formulates and advances the legislative agenda of the California community colleges to the state and federal governments. Prior to joining the Chancellor’s Office, Metune served as chief consultant for the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, where she provided analysis and recommendations on legislation related to public and private postsecondary education and student financial aid. Her previous positions included bureau chief for the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education and consultant for the Assembly Committee on Higher Education.

Following is an interview with Vice Chancellor Metune:

**What are the principal legislative priorities of the Chancellor’s Office?**

This year, the chancellor is focused on budget actions that will support the work of our colleges in improving student outcomes, including the proposal for $150 million in one-time funding to support colleges in creating guided pathways and integrating existing support programs to better serve students, the opportunity for $20 million
in one-time funding for innovation awards to be managed through the Chancellor’s Office, and ensuring that our colleges receive their share of the Proposition 98 Guarantee. We are poised to be underfunded by approximately $45 million because we are not getting our full share of Prop 98 funds.

You have experience in career technical education (CTE) and regulating for-profit colleges. In what directions do you see CTE going for the California Community Colleges?

Prior to joining the Chancellor’s Office, I worked with the Assembly Higher Education Committee and the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education, where my primary area of expertise was in oversight and regulation of for-profit colleges. A growing body of evidence highlights the high cost of for-profit CTE programs and for many programs the relatively low wage gains for graduates. More recently, we have seen the fallout associated with the closure and bankruptcy of predatory for-profit colleges. The continued infusion of funding for our community colleges to provide high-quality workforce training programs at low tuition costs is vital to the success of our students and economy.

Are there similarities in legislative priorities and processes of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education and the Senate Committee on Education?

Affordability is a common theme in both the senate and the assembly. In the assembly, there was a recent announcement of the Assembly Budget Subcommittee’s proposal of an investment of $1.5 billion in general fund revenues to student aid for CSU and UC students. This plan would also include about $100 million of Proposition 98 funding to be redirected to fees and access costs for community college students. This proposal is a departure from the Legislative Analyst’s Office proposal that $3.3 billion be spent on affordability, with 2/3 of the funds going to community college students. The senate has announced legislation aimed at linking student success and financial aid through increasing aid to support low-income students enrolling in a full-time course load.

The assembly and the senate are also both very interested in improving outcomes among students through reforms in assessment and placement and through basic
skills instruction and support. Assembly members Irwin and Medina have introduced legislation aimed at requiring CCCs and the CSU to use transcript information to make placement decisions rather than single assessment tests. The senate held an oversight hearing on the matter earlier this month.

**How significant are local advocacy efforts in shaping and influencing education policies?**

Community colleges are strongly supported among members of the legislature. Members see a clear connection between the needs of their communities and the education and services provided by their community colleges. There is no better way to carry our message forward to the legislature than through the advocacy efforts of local students, faculty, staff, and administrative leaders.

**Do you see any areas where community colleges can coordinate with private institutions?**

Absolutely. Streamlining transfer pathways between community colleges and high-quality private, non-profit institutions can help our students access baccalaureate degrees and help our state in addressing the impending degree shortfall. The transfer agreements with several Historically Black Colleges and Universities using the Associate Degree for Transfer framework are a model to build on with the independent colleges and universities.

**What is the Chancellor’s Office’s role in the accreditation situation for California community colleges?**

First and foremost, our priority must be to ensure that our students have access to federal financial aid programs. Our office is also working closely with constituent groups to address concerns and ensure reforms necessary for a peer accreditation process that applies rigorous standards in a collegial and constructive manner.

The Academic Senate extends a special thanks to Vice Chancellor Metune for this interview opportunity.
WHY LOCAL SENATES NEED A LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

by Cynthia Reiss, West Valley College

Faculty and senators often respond to administrative actions, especially those that seem to take place without prior discussion, in a reactive and frustrated manner. Indeed, some of these actions may originate at the behest of senior administration without ample discussions with participatory governance bodies. Other actions, however, may be local implementations of legislative mandates that are discussed at the state and system level for extended periods of time but that only reach faculty at the point of implementation at the local level.

Strengthening communication to local senates about state issues is critical to ensuring that local senates are able to have informed discussions and convey clear positions on proposed legislation. Additionally, in order for the ASCCC to be effective in representing the voice of faculty and in influencing legislation, a clear process is needed not only for providing information and analysis to local senates but also for receiving feedback and direction for action from local senates in a timely manner. For these reasons, the ASCCC encourages each local academic senate to establish a local legislative liaison position in response to Resolution 17.03, which was passed by the delegates at the 2015 Spring Plenary.

The ASCCC suggests that the responsibilities of a legislative liaison may include the following:
• Attend local senate meetings and report regularly or as requested about legislation and legislative issues.

• Facilitate or act as a resource for local discussions of legislation and contemplated legislation.

• Identify legislative issues of particular local concern and convey those issues to the ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee.

• Communicate opportunities and, when appropriate, the urgent need for faculty participation in legislative activities.

• Collaborate with local senate officers to create and or improve a mechanism for the most effective communication with faculty on campus about legislative issues of common concern.

• Serve as a conduit between the local faculty and the ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee representatives in the area.

• As funding permits, attend state-level events and meetings presented by the ASCCC and FACCC, participate in panels, or make presentations as appropriate.

• Monitor the ASCCC Legislative Listserv (legliaison@listserv.cccnext.net) and the Legislative Updates webpage and report to the local academic senate and, as determined to be appropriate in collaboration with local senate officers, faculty at large on campus.

• Work with local student organizations and advocacy groups to help them with their efforts as well as encourage them to join in efforts led by the academic senate and others.

This list is not exhaustive, but it provides a baseline for information and feedback between local senates and the ASCCC on legislative issues relevant to faculty. Commu-
Legislative and information from the Legislative and Advocacy Committee should encourage development of a consistent framework at local senates on issues discussed at the state and system level.

Legislative liaisons should play an important role in ensuring that local senates are able to provide timely feedback so that the ASCCC can more effectively influence, modify, support, or oppose proposed legislation. Additionally, liaisons should provide information to their local senates about current discussions at the state and system level so that faculty are apprised regarding proposed legislation, system mandates, and administrative decisions prior to implementation at the local level and can respond proactively to these issues and discussions.

The ASCCC Executive Committee understands that local senates and faculty in general have limited resources and time. As such, each senate should decide on the structure, tasks, responsibilities and expectations of the legislative liaison to best serve its college or district. However, two basic expectations for legislative liaisons should be standard for all local senates:

1) Sign up for the ASCCC Legislative Liaison Listserv—legliaison@listserv.cccnext.net.

2) Communicate with the local senate and faculty regarding state-level conversations relevant to the local college.

All senates that have a legislative liaison should consider agendizing a legislative update for the local senate approximately once per month. Senates that have not created a legislative liaison position should consider doing so and joining the dialog as soon as possible. The ASCCC requests that all local senates send the names of their legislative liaisons to info@asccc.org.
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON TRAINING OPPORTUNITY

This year, the ASCCC’s Legislative and Advocacy Committee is sponsoring an event concerning the role of the academic senate in legislative advocacy both at the system and local levels. This event will be held on June 14-15, 2017, the day prior to the annual Faculty Leadership Institute, in the same location and is free to registered legislative liaisons and Leadership Institute attendees. Faculty leaders are encouraged to attend the event and to bring with them or send their local legislative liaisons.

During this event, attendees will learn about the legislative cycle and the need for advocacy, how to interact with legislators and their staff, and ways to connect local advocacy to statewide politics. The following morning, attendees will tour the capitol.

To register, local senate presidents will first need to alert the ASCCC Office (info@asccc.org) with their liaison’s name, college, position, and email address. The legislative liaison can then register via the Faculty Leadership Institute webpage, once it is available in April.

Legislative liaisons have three primary duties:

- Sign up for the legislative liaison listserv at legliaison@listserv.cccnext.net.
- Review the Legislative Update page, particularly the reports attached at the bottom of the page, at http://www.asccc.org/legislative-updates.
- Report to the local academic senate about legislative activity.

The ASCCC urges colleges that are unable to send a legislative liaison to this event to ensure that they have identified a legislative liaison to be a conduit for the local senate in this important role.
ASCCC’S ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA ITEMS – AN UPDATE

The ASCCC Executive Committee has approved the following legislative priorities:

- **Full-Time Faculty and Faculty Diversification (Pathways to Community College Teaching):** The ASCCC and system partners continue to push for dedicated funding for full-time faculty and for the creation of a program to encourage students to consider careers in community college teaching.

- **Audit Fee:** Legal services at the Chancellor’s Office are aware of concerns with the audit fee but no further information is available at this time.

- **Veteran’s Support Centers and Services:** The ASCCC continues to advocate for veteran resources, and Executive Director Adams emceed the Veteran’s Summit in March 2017 to further raise awareness of this issue.

- **Funding for Mental Health Services:** While mental health services are widely accepted as a definite need for students, no movement by the legislature has occurred at this time to improve services.

- **Permanent and Sustainable Funding for C-ID:** A work plan has been developed to illustrate the value of C-ID to the system. The plan includes a sustainable budget aligned with the legislature’s and system’s priorities.
SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION FOR SPRING 2017 LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

by John Freitas, ASCCC Treasurer

The ASCCC Legislation and Advocacy Committee monitors numerous bills during the course of the legislative cycle and provides monthly reports to the Executive Committee, with special attention given to bills with implications for academic and professional matters. The reports include a summary of each bill, the bills’ current status in the legislature, and any relevant ASCCC positions and resolutions. All Legislation and Advocacy Committee reports are included in the Executive Committee agendas, and the most recent report is always available on the ASCCC Legislative Updates page at http://asccc.org/legislative-updates?page=1. Detailed information about all legislation is available on the California Legislative Information website at http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billStatusClient.xhtml. This searchable website provides detailed information about all bills, including text, analysis, and status. Reviewing both the Legislation and Advocacy Committee reports and detailed information about the bills is an excellent means to keep local senates informed about pending legislation that may impact service to our students.

AB19 (SANTIAGO) ENROLLMENT FEE WAIVER – CALIFORNIA AFFORDABILITY PROMISE

This bill would lower to at least $1 the amount of unmet financial need a student needs to demonstrate to qualify for a fee waiver.

**ASCCC POSITION/RESOLUTIONS:** The ASCCC has long held that access to education should not be limited by financial constraints as evidenced by many resolutions, including 6.01 S11, 6.01 F03, and 20.01 S03.

**AB21 (KALRA) ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EVERY STUDENT – URGENT**

Requires of the CCCs and CSUs, and requests of the UCs, that commencing with the 2017-2018 fiscal year they refrain from certain actions and take others related to students who face a significant risk of being unable to complete their studies because of possible actions by federal agencies or authorities and that they ensure that certain benefits and services provided to students are continued in the event that a specified federal policy is reversed.

**STATUS:** Introduced 12/5/16. Referred to Assembly Higher Education and Judiciary Committees on 1/19/17.

**ASCCC POSITION/RESOLUTIONS:** The ASCCC has long held that access to education should not be limited by financial constraints as evidenced by many resolutions, including 6.01 S11, 6.01 F03, and 20.01 S03. However, colleges may not be in a position to fulfill all of the proposed measures even when mandated costs are claimed.

**AB705 (IRWIN) SEYMOUR-CAMPBELL STUDENT SUCCESS ACT OF 2012: MATRICULATION: ASSESSMENT**

This bill would require, by August 1, 2018, each community college district or college to use high school transcript data in the assessment and subsequent placement of students to English and mathematics coursework in order to maximize the probability that the student will complete college-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe.
**STATUS**: Introduced 2/15/17. Referred to Assembly Higher Education Committee 3/2/17.

**ASCCC POSITION/RESOLUTIONS**: While the ASCCC has no position at this time, the ASCCC has previously opposed efforts to legislate curriculum standards.

**SB15 (LEYVA) CAL GRANT C AWARDS – URGENT**

This bill would, commencing with the 2017–18 award year and each award year thereafter, set maximum amounts for annual Cal Grant C awards for tuition and fees and for access costs. The bill would also provide that the maximum amount of a Cal Grant C award could be adjusted in the annual Budget Act for that award year, with the maximum award amount for tuition and fees and for access set at $2,462 and $3,000, respectively.

**STATUS**: Referred to Senate Higher Education Committee 1/12/17.

**ASCCC POSITION/RESOLUTIONS**: The ASCCC is very supportive of financial aid programs that improve access, including reforms to the Cal Grant program (6.01 S16).

**SB769 (HILL) BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PILOT PROGRAM**

This bill would limit the duplication prohibition to a district’s baccalaureate degree program that is offered within 100 miles of the CSU’s or UC’s baccalaureate degree program, would extend the operation of the statewide baccalaureate degree pilot program indefinitely, and would no longer require a student to complete his or her degree by the end of the 2022–23 academic year. The bill would also increase the maximum number of district baccalaureate degree pilot programs to 30.

**STATUS**: Introduced 2/17/17. Referred to Senate Education Committee 3/9/17.

**ASCCC POSITION/RESOLUTIONS**: The ASCCC has no position at this time.