



COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA

BILLS OF INTEREST
as of January 25, 2013

AB 13 (Chavez): Nonresident tuition exemption: veterans.
Bill Version: 12/03/12
Location: Assembly Committee on Higher Education

Summary: This bill would eliminate the requirement that a student be stationed in California for more than one year immediately prior to discharge to be exempt from paying non-resident tuition at public postsecondary institutions, including community colleges.

Arguments For: Veterans and their families have sacrificed a great deal and likely had no control of where they were stationed. It is a small cost for California to serve these students as if they are residents, and will pay dividends as they become civilian workers in the state's economy.

Arguments Against: Following several years of disinvestment of California's higher education system, the priority should be to restore access to California residents. Meanwhile, the federal government should pay the full cost of providing veterans the skills and knowledge necessary to transition to civilian employment.

Position: Support

AB 25 (Campos): Employment: Social media.
Bill Version: 12/03/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This bill would prohibit public employers, including community colleges, from requesting the access credentials (username and password) to social networks from current or potential employees.

Background: Similar language was adopted by the Legislature last year for private employers.

Arguments For: Social networks are akin to the family photo album and genealogical history, and contain information that frequently far predates actual or potential employment. Granting access to these vaults of information is akin to granting an employer the keys to someone's house and allowing them to rummage through personal records that could lead to discriminatory conduct.

Arguments Against: Community colleges and other public employers have a duty to protect the public, frequently including vulnerable students and minors. Social networks can provide valuable information that could enable an employer to catch early warning signs of inappropriate, or even dangerous, behavior.

Position: Watch

AB 29 (Williams): Proposition 39: implementation.
Bill Version: 12/03/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: The bill establishes three revolving loan funds for California Community Colleges, California State University and the University of California, funded primarily with revenue created by Prop 39.

Arguments For: This bill creates a framework California Community Colleges, California State University and the University of California to use the savings from the clean energy projects to assist with their budgets while achieving critical energy savings.

Arguments Against: The bill does not provide enough details about implementation and disbursement of loan funds.

Position: Watch

AB 39 (John A. Perez and Skinner): Proposition 39: implementation.

Bill Version: 12/03/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This bill would require the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to administer grants, no-interest loans, or other financial assistance to K-12 schools for projects that create jobs by reducing energy demand and consumption at these institutions.

Arguments For: This bill would provide no-interest loans for school districts to use for energy saving projects.

Arguments Against: This bill should be amended to specifically include community colleges, as the benefits would be similar to those at K-12 districts.

Position: Support if Amended

AB 41 (Buchanan): Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2014.

Bill Version: 12/07/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This spot bill could become a vehicle for a 2014 bond measure for K-12 through universities.

Arguments For: California's schools and colleges have significant facilities needs since the last state bond was approved by the voters in 2006. In its 2013-14 capital outlay update for the BOG, the Chancellor's Office indicated that the total facilities need for community colleges over the next ten years is \$35.8 billion.

Arguments Against: The state already has significant outstanding debt, which requires annual debt service payments that currently absorb 6% share of the state's General Fund revenues.

Position: Watch

AB 51 (Logue): Public postsecondary education: Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program.

Bill Version: 12/21/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This bill would establish a Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program that would include campuses of the California State University, community college districts, and high schools in three areas of the state, and currently lists Yuba, Butte, Long Beach, and San Joaquin Delta as participating community college districts. The pilot program strives to create a model of articulation and coordination among K-12 schools, community colleges, and campuses of the California State University that will allow students to earn a baccalaureate degree for a total cost not exceeding \$10,000 (including textbooks) The program is specifically for students majoring in STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) subjects.

Background: This bill is modeled after similar proposals made by the governors of Texas and Florida. Their preliminary strategies for achieving this goal are to provide statewide online courses, increase opportunities for students to spend their first two years at community colleges, and use accelerated and self-paced course formats.

Arguments For: This pilot program could provide a model for all higher education institutions to streamline and offer a path for STEM students to graduate with a college degree and meet the needs of the economic workforce at a lower cost than at present.

Arguments Against: This bill's financial feasibility is unreasonable, given that tuition and fees at CSU now exceed \$7,100 per year and the per-student cost in community colleges exceeds \$5,000. To suggest that a baccalaureate degree can be completed for \$10,000 including textbooks is setting up unmeetable expectations.

Position: Watch

AB 59 (Bonta): School districts: parcel taxes.
Bill Version: 01/07/13
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This bill would clarify existing law by stating that school and community college districts are allowed to assess parcel taxes in accordance with rational classifications among taxpayers or types of property within a district, as long as the taxes are applied uniformly within those classifications.

Background: This measure was introduced in response to parcel taxes which were approved for the Alameda USD and included a "split roll" provision in which commercial properties were assessed a higher parcel tax than residential properties.

Arguments For: This clarification could be the first "crack" in Proposition 13 by allowing a "split roll" for parcel taxes which will increase funding from parcel taxes and may lead to public support for a split property tax roll as well.

Arguments Against: It is misleading to call this a clarification of current law when it really is a change in law.

Position: Support and seek amendments to allow exemptions for senior citizens.

AB 67 (Gorell): Public postsecondary education: funding.
Bill Version: 01/07/13
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This bill would establish a mandatory freeze on fees for California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California until the 2018-2019 fiscal year, with tuition/fees not to exceed the amounts charged for the 2011-12 fiscal year.

Comment: This bill does not recognize that the Legislature has no authority to prevent increases at UC since it has constitutional protection; or that community college fees are already under the control of the Legislature.

Arguments For: Fees at all of the three systems have seen above-inflation increases in recent years. This bill also would assure that Prop 30 funding will be directed to the California Community Colleges, CSU and UC systems to prevent fee increases.

Arguments Against: By mandating a tuition freeze for several years, educational institutions are faced with a very difficult challenge of balancing both affordability and quality of education for their increasing student populations.

Position: Watch

AJR 3 (Alejo): Immigration.
Bill Version: 12/03/12
Location: Assembly Desk

Summary: This measure specifies principles for improving the nation's immigration system and urges Congress and the President of the United States to take a comprehensive and workable approach to improving the nation's immigration system using those principles.

Arguments For: California would benefit economically if undocumented persons were provided with a path to citizenship so that they could engage in lawful employment.

Arguments Against: Immigration is a federal issue; California should not be interfering with responsibilities of Congress and the President.

Position: Support

SB 35 (Pavley): Higher education: energy conservation.
Bill Version: 12/04/12
Location: Senate Committee on Energy, Utilities and Communication

Summary: This bill requires the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and requests the Regents of the University of California, to each develop and administer a Systemwide Energy Solutions Action Plan that provides a near- and long-term strategy for assessing, evaluating, contracting for, overseeing, auditing, measuring, and communicating publicly concerning energy savings projects.

Arguments For: This bill strives to lower California's higher education costs through comprehensive energy savings action plans at the state's public colleges and universities.

Arguments Against: There is currently no funding mechanism for implementing the action plans.

Position: Watch

SB 39 (De Leon and Steinberg): Energy: school facilities: energy efficiency upgrade projects.
Bill Version: 12/05/12
Location: Senate Committee on Education

Summary: This bill enacts the Clean Energy Employment and Student Advancement Act of 2013 and establishes a school district assistance program to distribute grants, on a competitive basis, for energy efficiency upgrade projects.

Arguments For: This initiative is expected to create thousands of new jobs, as well as create a framework for school districts to retrofit their buildings and increase energy savings.

Arguments Against: The current bill language does not include community colleges.

Position: Support if Amended

SB 58 (Cannella): Public postsecondary education: funding.
Bill Version: 01/07/13
Location: Senate Rules

Summary: This bill would establish a mandatory tuition freeze for California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California until the 2018-2019 fiscal year. Tuition fees are not to exceed the tuition charged to students for the 2011-12 fiscal year.

Comment: This bill does not recognize that the Legislature has no authority to prevent increases at UC since it has constitutional protection; or that community college fees are already under the complete control of the Legislature.

Arguments For: Fees at all three systems have risen too quickly in recent years; this bill is intended to prevent increases from further eroding the affordability of our colleges and universities.

Arguments Against: Mandating tuition freezes without guaranteeing adequate revenues for higher education institutions are likely to lead to further erosions of quality at our higher education institutions.

Position: Watch

SCA 3 (Hill and Leno and Pavley): Taxation: educational entities: parcel tax.

Bill Version: 12/03/12

Location: Senate Rules

Summary: This constitutional amendment would authorize a school or community college district, or the county office of education to impose, extend or increase parcel taxes with a 55% voter approval instead of a 2/3 majority vote (as currently required by Prop 13).

Arguments For: Lowering the threshold from the 2/3 to 55% vote would be more democratic in allowing a smaller majority of the electorate to approve a parcel tax.

Arguments Against: This amendment can be viewed as an erosion of Prop 13 as it makes it easier for school and community college districts and county boards of education to levy new taxes.

Position: Support