Legislative and Advocacy Committee

(formerly Legislation and Governmental Relations Committee)

October 29, 2014

10:00am – 3:00pm

ASCCC Offices, One Capitol Mall, Suite 340

Minutes

Attendees: Angeles Abraham, Julie Adams, Kale Braden, Julie Bruno, Dan Crump, Silvester Henderson, David Morse, Stacey Searl-Chapin

Guest: Vincent Stewart, Vice Chancellor of Governmental Relations

Note-takers: Julie Bruno and Dan Crump

Bruno called the meeting to order at 10:20am

1. Agenda approved with additions.
2. September 25 meeting minutes were approved with minor corrections.
3. LGRC Title Change – Bruno informed members that the Executive Committee approved the request for a title change. The committee’s name is now the Legislative and Advocacy Committee. The website was changed to reflect the new moniker.
4. Legislation – Members discussed the following items as topics of possible legislation
   1. SB 850 – Members entertained the idea of follow up legislation to codify the need for statewide coordination of the curricular requirements of the Bachelor Degrees. Some of the issues that need to be addressed include
      1. Upper division courses
      2. Articulation of upper division courses to CSU and UC
      3. Ensuring the rigor and integrity of Bachelors degrees
      4. Local approval of upper division major and GE courses including Curriculum Committee standards
      5. Minimum Qualifications for upper division courses
      6. Additional issues that are not necessarily curricular but impact local processes include local resources, funding, and workload as well as Chancellor’s Office approval processes for upper division courses and Bachelors programs.
   2. SB 440 – Members discussed possible clean up legislation to address restrictive mandates.
      1. The field is discussing the possibility of the Chancellor’s Office inactivating local degrees if a college does not develop an ADT.
      2. There are concerns that if exceptions are permitted than those who developed ADTs may take umbrage at others colleges circumventing the mandate.
      3. It was noted that some colleges feel that they are being forced to reduce the units of courses to be able to include those courses in their ADTs.
      4. Possible legislative solutions were discussed.
   3. SB 967 – Members briefly discussed the impact of this legislation.
5. Legislation conversation with Vince Stewart, Vice Chancellor, Governmental Relations
   1. Legislation Process – Stewart described the process for developing the Chancellor’s Office legislative proposal including
      1. Convening of the Legislative Task Force, which is a subcommittee of Consultation Council and consists of constituency representatives as well as other interested parties.
      2. Task Force members are invited to submit proposals with some restrictions including bargaining implications or those that are unique to a local college or district.
      3. All proposals are distributed to members of Task force to walk through and get feedback.
      4. All proposals are then brought to Consultation Council for discussion.
      5. Based on feedback, the Chancellor’s Office determines which proposals will go forward for consideration by the Board of Governors.
      6. Proposals are present to the BoG with a follow up in January.
   2. The following proposals were submitted for review
      1. Concurrent Enrollment
      2. Audit Fee increase
      3. Cal Grants
      4. Public Safety
   3. Legislation Agenda for 2015
      1. At present, only the proposal on concurrent enrollment will be presented to the BoG.
      2. Community College League of California will sponsor the Audit Fee adjustment and possibly the Cal Grants legislation
      3. The public safety proposal will not go forward but the CO is investigating a change to Title 5 to address the need identified.
      4. Stewart noted that there might be follow up legislation to SB967 (deLeon). There are many unanswered questions around implementation as well as possible unintended consequences. The CO is in conversations with their counterparts at CSU and UC.
      5. AB 86 – there may also be follow up legislation proposed on Adult Education.
      6. SB 440 -Committee members discussed possible follow up legislation to SB 440. It was noted that any follow up legislation would most likely entail dealing with the Campaign for College Opportunity since they originally sponsored both SB 1440 and SB 440. Other strategies to address the legislative mandates may be more productive at this time.
      7. SB 850 -The need for statewide coordination was noted. Committee members shared their concerns with Stewart. Stewart advised investigating regulatory changes and to continue to work with the CSU academic senate.
      8. Will see additional legislation
         1. Adult education
         2. Plans will identify gaps and trends
         3. Regional consortia – what is the scope of their authority
         4. Curricular and resource base discussion
6. Local Legislative Advocacy – Survey
   1. Committee member discussed and revised the survey on legislative liaisons
   2. Henderson brought forward the idea of having a legislative point person for each area to disseminate and capture legislative information and act as a conduit to this committee. Members agreed with the idea and refined the proposal to have LAC members serve as the legislative point person for each area.
7. Plenary Breakout – members discussed the content of the Legislative breakout for session. Some ideas include
   1. Define senate bill and assembly bill as well as Title 5 and Education Code
   2. Identify the individuals and organizations who participate in legislation
   3. Provide an overview of the legislative process
   4. The Committee offered suggestions for Stewart’s participation including
      1. Who he is
      2. What he does
      3. Legislation that has passed
         1. Accreditation
         2. SB850
         3. AB86
         4. Sexual Assault
      4. What’s coming up ­- Legislative agenda for 2015
      5. Talk about evolution of bills and how things work
   5. Q&A
8. Discussion
   1. Committee members discussed the distribution of information and possible formats. Ideas included providing a synopsis of the legislation, amendments, and ASCCC resolutions or positions, if they exist. The report would be uploaded to the committee page or an Advocacy web page or both.
   2. Members discussed strengthening knowledge of AB1725 at local level as well as defining primacy and determined that this is an issue for Local senates
   3. ASCCC and CCLC Scenario – members determined that it is time to update the scenarios. Adams noted that a joint task force of representatives from the Community College League of California and the ASCCC developed the current scenarios. The scenarios have been endorsed by California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and the Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges (CEOCCC) as well as by ASCCC resolution. Morse will contact the League to see if they are open to updating the scenarios.
   4. Spring plenary– members discussed possible spring session breakouts including a history of AB1725 and a panel presentation with administrators that have adapted to the system from another state and their senate presidents.
9. Schedule Next Meeting - postponed
10. Adjourn at 2:40pm