College of the Canyons Advocacy Team Meeting
2:30 p.m. to 4 p.m., Thursday, December 1, 2011
University Center, Room 223

Meeting Minutes

Welcome & Introductions
The following people attended the meeting: Casey Bingham, Barry Gribbons, Eric Harnish, Michael Joslin, Allison Korse-Devlin, Margaret Lundgren, Cathy Ritz, Mimi Spankroy, and Dianne Van Hook.

2011 State Legislation
Mr. Harnish reviewed the attached handout, which highlights state legislation pertaining to community colleges that was enacted or vetoed in 2011.

Student Success Task Force Recommendations
Mr. Harnish distributed the attached handout and discussed the recommendations made by the task force, as well as the changes to the recommendations that have been implemented during the feedback-gathering process.

Economic & Workforce Development Reauthorization
Dr. Van Hook reviewed the attached handouts, which show the impact of the Economic and Workforce Development Program (EWD) throughout the state, and detail the $7.1 million that College of the Canyons has received since 1997-98 to provide training for local businesses.

She also noted that the college will ask for letters to be written to legislators and the governor in mid-February to highlight the importance of reauthorizing EWD funds and how local companies benefit.

Bond Update
Dr. Van Hook provided an update on local general obligation bond elections that took place in California K-12 and community college districts during 2011. As evidenced in the results summarized in the attached handout, there is still strong support in local communities for spending on education. One district (Santa Clara Unified) attempted a parcel tax, but it failed, receiving only 40.97 percent of the vote when it needed 66 percent to pass.

The Legislature is considering a statewide facilities bond for November 2012 that would benefit K-12 and community college districts. College of the Canyons would receive funding for the science lab and classroom/lab buildings at the Canyon Country Campus. Because the state has not placed construction bonds on the ballot in recent elections, our need for these facilities has grown as enrollment increased at the Canyon Country Campus. As a result, the college will pay a smaller percentage of the construction cost. It is estimated that our share will be $6.4 million instead of $21 million. So although the facilities are delayed in coming online, the college will realize a significant cost savings and stretch the Measure M bond funding to cover more projects.
**State Budget Update**
Mr. Harnish reviewed the attached handout which summarizes the current status of the state budget and discusses the proposed ballot initiatives being put forward by the governor and other groups to raise taxes.

Dr. Van Hook noted that in Santa Clarita, economic indicators are improving. Hiring is up, foreclosures are down, and there is a shortage of vacant industrial space. The largest spaces available are 50,000 square feet or less.

**Adjournment**
The next meeting will be held in the first part of February. At that time, the governor will have released his 2012-13 budget proposal in January, and college staff will have attended the Community College League of California Advocacy Conference where the impact of the budget will be discussed in detail.

At that point, sample letters will be drafted for the committee to use in contacting legislators and advocating on behalf of the college for adequate funding.
Final Action on 2011 Legislation

December 1, 2011

Eric Harnish, Special Assistant to the Chancellor/
Interim Managing Director, Government Relations & Advocacy
BOG Bill Package

- Chancellor’s Office went 3 for 4 in this legislative session.
  - AB 743 (Block): Establishes a centralized common assessment system for community college students. **CHAPTERED**
  - AB 1029 (Lara) Stand Alone Course Approval (Sponsor) extends the authority granted to local districts to approve stand alone courses at the local level. A report is due to the Legislature by January 1, 2013. Unless extended by legislation, local authority to approve stand alone courses expires on January 1, 2014. **CHAPTERED**
  - AB 1056 (Fong): Requires the Office of the Chancellor to implement a procedure for electronic student transcripts by districts. **CHAPTERED**
Signed Bills

- **ABX1 32 (Blumenfield) Education Finance:** ABX1 32 is one of four bills from the first extraordinary session on the budget to address technical issues related to the potential additional cuts triggered by lower than expected revenues. For community colleges, ABX1 32 delays implementing the $10 per unit student fee increase from winter term to the summer term of the 2011-12 academic year. This extraordinary session bill is effective immediately upon signature.

- **AB 130 (Cedillo) Financial Aid for AB 540 students (nonstate funds):** AB 130 authorizes students who receive resident tuition through AB 540 (Firebaugh, 2001) to be eligible to receive a scholarship derived from non-state funds beginning January 1, 2012 for students attending college at UC, CSU, or CCC.

- **AB 131 (Cedillo) Dream ACT:** Effective January 1, 2013, AB 131 Expands eligibility for state-administered student financial aid programs to include AB 540 (Firebaugh, 2001) students.
Signed Bills

- **AB 194 (Beall)**: Provides enrollment priority for foster youth or emancipated foster youth up to the age of 24 at a community college and a California State University campus.

- **AB 230 (Carter)**: Middle College High School Concurrent Enrollment - Exempts students attending Middle College High Schools who enroll in community college courses, from the requirement that community colleges assign low enrollment priority to concurrent enrollment students.

- **AB 334 (Lowenthal)**: CC Board Members – Authorizes the governing board of a school district or a community college district to authorize an absence of an unlimited duration in the case of illness or other urgent necessity.
Signed Bills

• AB 620 (Block): Requests community college districts and UC (and requires CSU) to establish nondiscrimination policies for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender students.

• AB 636 (Knight) Military Benefits: Removes the requirement that a student on a military deployment must meet the withdrawal deadline in order to receive a refund for tuition and fees.

• AB 684 (Block): Authorizes the Board of Governors to approve a community college district’s change from at large trustee representation to local area trustees through a waiver process (urgency measure, effective immediately upon signature).
Signed Bills

- **AB 882 (Cook):** Provides members of the armed forces and their dependents resident classification for calculating tuition and fees for the duration of their enrollment in a public institution of higher education.

- **AB 900 (Buchanan):** Jobs and Economic Improvement through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011: Establishes an expedited CEQA review for environmental impact reports and approvals for certain projects which could include community college facilities projects.

- **AB 1330 (Furutani):** Provides high school students the option of using a career technical education (CTE) course to fulfill the existing high school requirement to take a course in visual or performing arts or foreign language.
Signed Bills

• SB 8 (Yee) Auxiliary Organizations – Public Records. Applies provisions of the California Public Records Act (CPRA) to auxiliary organizations of the UC, CSU, local CCDs, and the official auxiliary to the Chancellor’s Office, and includes protections for donor anonymity.

• SB 451 (Price): Requires CSAC to grant high priority to Cal Grant C applicants pursuing occupations or technical training in high-growth, high-wage or high-demand job sectors, and students enrolling in programs that rate high in graduation rates and job placement data.

• SB 611 (Steinberg): Requests the Regents of the University of California to establish and maintain the University of California Curriculum Integration Institute (UCCII) to develop high school CTE curriculum.
Signed Bills

• SB 612 (Steinberg): Establishes additional California Subject Matter Projects.

• SB 774 (Hancock) Community College Parking Fees. Authorizes the governing board of a community college district to increase parking fee limits charged to students and employees to a maximum of $50 per semester and provides for annual increases to the fee limit.

• SB 813 (Cmte on Veterans): Grants priority registration for four years for student veterans who are California residents.
Vetoed Bills

- **AB 91 (Portantino):** Requires the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to establish a voluntary pilot program to increase student participation in state and federal financial aid programs.

- **AB 288 (Fong):** Authorizes the governing board or designee(s), of a district to deny, permit, or place conditions on the enrollment of an individual who has been expelled from a community college within the preceding 5 years, or who is undergoing expulsion procedures for certain offenses.

- **AB 1310 (Furutani):** Requires the Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development to collaborate with the Chancellor’s Office, California Workforce Investment Board, CSU, UC, CDE and other agencies on the development of a strategic plan for connecting education and workforce development.
Student Success Task Force Recommendations

College of the Canyons Advocacy Committee
December 1, 2011
Recommendations

- **Increase College and Career Readiness**
  - Collaborate with K-12 to jointly develop common core standards for college and career readiness.

- **Strengthen Support for Entering Students**
  - Develop and implement common centralized diagnostic assessments.
  - Require students to participate in diagnostic assessment, orientation and the development of an educational plan.
  - Develop and use technology applications to better guide students in educational process.
  - Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources.
  - Require students to declare a program of study early in their academic careers.
Recommendations

- **Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors**
  - Adopt system-wide enrollment priorities reflecting core mission of community colleges.
  - Require students receiving Board of Governors fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements.
  - Provide students the opportunity to consider attending full time.
  - Require students to begin addressing Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year.

- **Align Course Offering to Meet Student Needs**
  - Focus course offerings and schedules on needs of students.
Recommendations

• **Improve the Education of Basic Skills Students**
  - Support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills Curriculum.
  - Develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skill education in California.

• **Revitalize and Re-Envision Professional Development**
  - Create a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities.
  - Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services.
Recommendations

• Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership & Increase Coordination Among Colleges
  ✓ Develop and support a strong community college system office.
  ✓ Set local student success goals consistent with statewide goals.
  ✓ Implement a student success score card.
  ✓ Develop and support a longitudinal student record system.
Recommendations

• **Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations**
  ✓ Consolidate select categorical programs.
  ✓ Invest in the new Student Support Initiative.
  ✓ Promote flexibility and innovation in basic skills through alternative funding mechanism.
  ✓ Do not implement outcome-based funding at this time.
Changes

- Proposal to consolidate categorical program funding was eliminated.

- Proposal to limit non-credit classes to only those identified as Career Development or College Preparation will be modified to protect access to high priority courses, including Citizenship, English as a Second Language (ESL), and courses for individuals with acquired brain injuries.

- Proposal to charge students the full cost of instruction for any courses not included in their education plans was eliminated.
Changes

- Proposed alternative funding model for Basic Skills will be modified to provide the Chancellor’s Office with the authority to develop alternate funding allocations, using apportionment funding, to promote innovation in basic skills instruction.
Student Success Task Force Timeline

- Jan 2011: Research, Analysis, and Synthesis by Task Force
- May – June: Preliminary Recommendations
- July: Fine Tuning Recommendations
- Dec – Jan 2012: Final Recommendations

Virtual Statewide Dialogue
Timeline: Next Steps

- December 1, 2011 (San Diego) Special Board of Governors meeting to review draft recommendations
- December 7, 2011 (Sacramento) Review draft of report for transmittal to the Board of Governors
- January 9-10, 2012 (Sacramento) Board of Governors to take action on draft recommendations
Legislative Implementation

- Student Success Task Force recommendations will be the focus of the Chancellor’s Office 2012 legislative efforts.
  - Staff is currently working to identify authors to carry legislation as committee finalizes its recommendations.
  - Similar recommendations will likely be grouped together into bills so legislation is limited to 2 or 3 bills.
  - This is the second year of a two-year legislative session, so it will be challenging to get this type of complicated legislation passed in one year.
  - Committee consultants have reacted favorably to recommendations and commented that they didn’t expect the committee to be so bold.
  - As a result, it is highly unlikely that performance based funding will move forward.
  - The recommendations are expected to provide leverage in budget advocacy as they show the system has taken steps to show it is prioritizing resources, and working to boost its efficiency and effectiveness.
Dear CEO Colleague:

The California Community College’s Economic and Workforce Development (EWD) Program will be up for legislative reauthorization in 2012.

This is the one of the key mechanisms by which our colleges create jobs for our students, assist our businesses in being successful, and rebuild our economy. To that end, it is imperative that we advocate both for its permanent reauthorization as well as adequate funding.

Please make a point of reaching out to your local legislators in the coming weeks as the 2012-13 state budget is under development. Attached are talking points you can use in meetings.

As you talk with your Assemblymembers and Senators, remind them that the EWD:

- Impacts students, current workforce, the unemployed, colleges and businesses. Between 2001 and 2009, the program:
  - Trained 399,000 incumbent workers;
  - Taught 497,000 students in courses developed by EWD Program Initiatives;
  - Served 392,000 California businesses; and
  - Placed 44,200 employees in jobs.
- Connects colleges with employers and the in-demand technologies needed in the workforce
- Infuses technology and industry needs back into college programs on campus
- Connects community college faculty to industry and keeps colleges on the cutting edge
- Creates partnerships that expand resources available to colleges for innovative new programs
- Generates resources for colleges through contracts with business, grants and donations

To build on this success, the Program should be reauthorized permanently through legislation.

Thank you for your help, and I look forward to hearing the results of your efforts.

Dr. Dianne Van Hook
Chancellor
Grow Jobs, Don’t Kill Them
Continue Funding the Community College Economic and Workforce Development Program

*Smart Investments for California’s Economic Recovery*

The Community College Economic and Workforce Development Program (EWD) supports local jobs and businesses across the state. EWD programs grow local jobs by both improving local business competitiveness and by training workers to the skills they need to keep their job or to move to a higher paying one. EWD programs are so effective at increasing local businesses activity, employment, and worker income that state and local tax revenues exceed the cost of funding EWD programs.

*Track Record of Innovation & Quality Services*

Unlike other Community College programs, EWD preserves jobs and creates new ones by training workers to meet business needs in days, not months. From 2002 to 2009, EWD programs annually assisted an average of 41,000 businesses, 107,000 students and trainees, and placed 4,300 individuals in jobs.

*Independent Economic Analysis Fast Facts*

Time Structures, Inc. conducted an independent economic impact analysis of the EWD programs and services.

**EWD: Increases Worker Income Potential**

Approximately 3,400 trained workers’ wages were compared over a three year period using the California Employment Development Department database with the wages of workers similarly employed, but without training. The average trained worker earned an additional $6,000 over the next three years—a $2,000 increase in annual salary.

**EWD: Improves the Demand for Workers**

In a study of 2,244 private businesses utilizing EWD business assistance programs, it was found that, compared to similar businesses not receiving such help, each assisted business hired an average of 1.4 more workers for a total of 3,152 jobs created. It was the smaller businesses—those with fewer than 50 employees and who employ the majority of California workers—that saw the majority of the program benefits.

**EWD: No Cost to California Taxpayers**

The analysis revealed that it cost the state of California an average of $589 to train each worker in a highly concentrated one-time course. Each newly trained worker earned a higher wage, and subsequently paid an additional $450 in state and local taxes over the next three years. Their higher tax payments returned almost 80 percent of the State’s costs for the training. For workers already employed, EWD training improved their workplace skills making it possible to get promoted. For job seekers, EWD training increased their chance of finding employment, thereby reducing state expenditures for unemployment benefits and other government funded assistance programs.

EWD business assistance programs generated an even more immediate return to the state— for every state dollar spent on business training, two dollars in state and local revenues were generated over the next two years, more than covering program cost.

Workers benefit directly from higher employment and wages generated by EWD programs. Community businesses and residents benefit too from the spending of the additional income earned by program enrollees. And, significantly, these benefits are achieved at no cost to the state’s taxpayers.

**EWD Funding – Smart Investments for California’s Economic Recovery**

For more information, go to [www.CCCEWD.net](http://www.CCCEWD.net), or [www.InvestmentsThatCount.org](http://www.InvestmentsThatCount.org).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>FY 97-98</th>
<th>FY 98-99</th>
<th>FY 99-00</th>
<th>FY 00-01</th>
<th>FY 01-02</th>
<th>FY 02-03</th>
<th>FY 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACT Grant</td>
<td>$166,800</td>
<td>178,875</td>
<td>$178,500</td>
<td>$169,507</td>
<td>$136,295</td>
<td>$147,170</td>
<td>$169,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 1 Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>99,747</td>
<td>$70,841</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 2 Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>120,433</td>
<td>$71,686</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 3 Explore Mfg</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$177,005</td>
<td>$40,214</td>
<td>$14,755</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 4 Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 5 Biotech</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 6 Digital Mfg</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 7 Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-Driven 8 Incubator</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide EWD Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTF Grant - Henry Mayo</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTF Grant - Adv. Bionics</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTF Grant - Boston Sci.</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDIF Grant - Assembly</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orange CCD Sub Award</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD Coordination Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04-05</td>
<td>FY 05-06</td>
<td>FY 06-07</td>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$178,875</td>
<td>$178,875</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$112,355</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$155,255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$242,745</td>
<td>$68,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$277,161</td>
<td>$248,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,713</td>
<td>$170,308</td>
<td>$84,465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$425,981</td>
<td>$374,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$245,199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$54,139</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$44,200</td>
<td>$176,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$198,381</td>
<td>$198,381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2011 Local Bond Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Result (% of Yes Votes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Union School District bond proposition, Measure T (November 2011)</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
<td>Pass - 61.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Unified School District bond proposition, Measure S (April 2011)</td>
<td>$270 million</td>
<td>Pass - 69.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur School District bond proposition, Measure A (November 2011)</td>
<td>$26 million</td>
<td>Pass - 70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae School District bond proposition, Measure N (November 2011)</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>Pass - 58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Unified School District bond proposition, Measure G (November 2011)</td>
<td>$63 million</td>
<td>Pass - 55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall School District bond proposition, Measure E (November 2011)</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>Pass - 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Park School District bond proposition, Measure O (November 2011)</td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td>Fail - 50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District bond, Proposition A (November 2011)</td>
<td>$531 million</td>
<td>Pass - 71.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Community College District bond proposition, Measure H (November 2011)</td>
<td>$564 million</td>
<td>Fail - 53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Unified School District parcel tax and bond, Measure A (March 2011)</td>
<td>$788 million*</td>
<td>Fail - 40.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Required a 2/3 super-majority to pass as it also would have authorized the levy of an annual tax of $19.00 on existing residential units, and authorized both a one-time tax and an annual tax on new residential units.
State Budget Update
College of the Canyons Advocacy Committee
December 1, 2011

Background
The 2011-12 state budget cut $290 million from community colleges and raised fees from $26 per unit to $36 per unit.

It also included an assumption that California would generate $4 billion in new revenue during the budget year. However, automatic triggers will take effect, should that money fail to materialize.
  - **Tier 0** - No midyear cuts will be required if at least $3 billion of the $4 billion of the higher revenues is received.
  - **Tier 1** - If only $2 billion to $3 billion of the revenues materialize, community colleges would sustain a $30 million General Fund reduction, and enrollment fees would increase to $46 per unit.
  - **Tier 2** - If less than $2 billion of the revenues is received, community colleges could receive a reduction to apportionments of up to $72 million beyond the Tier 1 cuts. These reductions would be proportionate to revenue estimates.

Current Status
For the month of October, alone, the State Controller’s Office reported that cash receipts were $810 million below expectations, bringing the cumulative cash deficit to $1.5 billion for the first four months of the year.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office released a forecast in November that estimated current year revenues to be about $3.7 billion below budget assumptions.

While there are other factors that will play into the decision to pull the Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 cuts, a cash deficit of this magnitude so early in the fiscal year leads many budget watchers to conclude the triggers will be pulled.

Next Steps
The Department of Finance will release its own forecast on December 15. According to the trigger language, the state’s Finance Director is to use the higher of the November LAO forecast or the December DOF forecast to determine whether or not revenues are tracking with budget assumptions and make a decision on whether to pull the triggers.

The college’s budget for 2011-12 assumed the triggers would be pulled. The estimated $1.4 million reduction that would be COC’s share of the cuts have been built into the budget.
Ballot Proposals
The November ballot may be crowded with tax proposals. Three different proposals are already being touted by various backers to help close the state’s ongoing budget gap.

First, the Think Long Committee, which includes California billionaires and political insiders, put forward a proposal last month they said would generate $5 billion for public schools every year, plus billions more for higher education and local government.

Their plan would:
- Lower the state's personal income and sales tax rates.
- Create a new levy of more than 5% on services that are not currently taxed, such as legal work or accounting.
- Exempt families earning up to $45,000 a year from paying state income tax.
- Limit those making up to $95,000 annually to paying 2%.
- Double the current exemption for homeowners and renters on their state income tax and eliminate most other California income tax credits.

The group says it will file ballot language with the Secretary of State and begin collecting signatures in coming weeks.

Second, labor unions are considering their own ballot proposal. It would raise income taxes on high earners and increase the state sales tax.

Finally, Governor Brown is expected to announce a plan similar to what the labor unions have proposed. No official announcement has been made, but insiders say the proposal would:
- Raise levies on upper-income earners.
- Increase the state’s sales tax by half a cent.
- Add an extra 1% tax on individual income above $250,000 a year.
  - Residents making between $300,000 and $500,000 would be taxed an additional 1.5%.
  - Those making more than $500,000 would see an additional 2% hike.

The governor’s plan is expected to generate $7 billion in annual revenue. Language may be filed with the Secretary of State as early as Friday.