College of the Canyons
Advocacy Committee Meeting
4:00-5:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 12, 2013
University Center, Room 258

Meeting Minutes

1. Welcome and Self-Introductions
   The following people attended the meeting:
   - Edel Alonso, Academic Senate President
   - Casey Bingham, City of Santa Clarita
   - Jennifer Brezina, Dean, Humanities,
   - Sharlene Coleal, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Business Services
   - Vincent Devlahovich, President, College of the Canyons Faculty Association
   - Susan Gilbert, Guest of Cathy Ritz
   - Amanda Goedike, Six Flags Magic Mountain
   - Cindy Grandgeorge, Controller
   - Barry Gribbons, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology and Online Services
   - Eric Harnish, Special Assistant to the Chancellor/Interim Managing Director of Government Relations and Advocacy
   - Michael Kramer, President, Associated Student Government
   - Randy Moberg, LBW Insurance
   - Cathy Ritz, Chief Operational Officer, COC Foundation/Interim Director, University Center
   - Jim Schrage, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Facilities Planning, Operations, and Construction
   - Mimi Spankroy, Director, Payroll Services
   - Dianne Van Hook, Chancellor
   - John Varga, Professor, History
   - Joanna Vargas, Administrative Assistant to President, Associated Student Government
   - Russell Waldon, Professor, Business

2. 2013-14 Budget Update
   Ms. Coleal reviewed the attached handout.
   - She noted that Prop 30 funding is temporary, and will end in four years (when sales tax increase expires), and seven years (when income tax increases expire).
   - Even with a temporary increase in Prop 30 revenue, the college’s funding levels will not be back to where they were five years ago, and our spending power will be diminished.
Dr. Van Hook noted that because the revenue is temporary, and not ongoing, it is difficult to obligate the revenue for ongoing items like hiring additional personnel and salary adjustments.

3. Statewide Facilities Construction Bond
Mr. Schrage provided the following update on a proposed statewide facilities construction:
- California has not placed a bond on the statewide ballot since 2006.
- When bond funding is available, community college districts get one building per district, per year, so there is a backlog of education facilities construction statewide.
- The Valencia campus is nearly built out, so all new building in the district will be at the Canyon Country Campus.
- By 2015, when the Culinary Arts Facility is complete, the Valencia campus will be done with new construction.
- We have three projects currently slated for the Canyon Country Campus.
  - Because of Measure M, we have our share of construction costs on hand.
  - We are now waiting for the state to come up with their money through a statewide facilities construction bond.
- The Science Building is estimated to cost $18 million. Our share is $3.6 million.
- The Administration/Classroom Building is estimated to cost $25 million. Our share would be $3.6 million. If this project is eligible for state resources, it would be funded from a 2016 bond.
- Those two buildings represent 72,000 square feet of space. When built, they will effectively double the size of the current Canyon Country Campus.
- Dr. Van Hook noted that eligibility for state funding of new construction is determined five years in advance.
  - Eligibility is determined based on the amount of space currently availability versus the space we will need based on enrollment.
  - The greater the need for space, the greater our eligibility for funding, and the less our share of construction costs will be. Eligibility is also improved by providing a local funding match.
  - Because the need for instructional space is strong at the Canyon Country Campus, our share of construction costs has dropped from 25 percent to 10 and 15 percent on the respective buildings.
- Ms. Alonso asked how likely it is that the split of bond funding will give community colleges 50 percent of the funding, rather than a third, as in years past.
  - Dr. Van Hook noted that community colleges can make a strong case for an increased share of bond funds, as they serve more students than UC and CSU combined. Plus, the cost of one building at a UC campus often equals the cost of four or five buildings at a community college.

4. Legislation of Interest
Mr. Harnish distributed the attached handout and reviewed the following bills:
- AB 806 – Would amend the 50% Law, which requires community college districts to spend 50% of general fund money on the salaries and benefits of classroom instructors.
- AB 955 – Would allow a community college district to maintain an extension program offering credit courses during summer and winter intersessions.
- SB 594 – Authorizes three new financing tools for K-14 districts to encourage business participation in career pathways programs.
• AB 283 – Would provide the California Community Colleges with an automatic property tax backfill when actual property taxes come in below projections.
• SCA3 – Would lower approval threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent of voters for the imposition, extension, or increase of a parcel tax.

5. Advocacy Trips
Mr. Harnish reviewed the upcoming KHTS Sacramento Road Trip, in which three trustees are participating, as well as nine members of the college’s Leadership Education in Action Program.

Mr. Kramer provided an update on the Associated Student Government’s visit to Sacramento, and their discussions with legislators on two bills that deal with limiting tuition increases:
• AB 67 (Gorell) – Would prohibit tuition increases at campuses in California’s three systems of higher education through 2018-19.
• AB 138 (Olsen) – Would require that fees set for freshman at CSU and UC would not be increased until that class has completed at least four academic years.

6. Prop. 39
Dr. Dianne Van Hook reviewed the attached handout, which provides an overview of the bills introduced to delineate how Prop 39 “Clean Energy Clean Jobs” funds should be spent.

Dr. Van Hook concluded the meeting by thanking the representatives of external agencies for attending, as they can be particularly helpful in communicating our priorities to legislators. She also noted that legislative advocacy is particularly effective when employees from throughout the campus become involved.

The next meeting of the committee will be scheduled following the release of the May Revise of the governor’s 2013-14 budget.
2012-13 State Budget - Background
Community College funding has been reduced over the last 5 years as a result of the State economic downturn with 10% base revenue cuts, no COLA and no Growth funding. Proposition 30 is a temporary fix to prevent further erosion of K-12 and Community College budgets. Community College budgets are still below 2007-08 levels even with Proposition 30.

2012-2013 State Budget (With Prop 30): Community College System
- No COLA
- No Growth
- No Categorical Restoration
- Revenue Deferral Reduced from $961 Million to $801 Million
- Mandated Cost Block Grant - $28/FTE
- $50 Million in Growth Restoration

Proposition 30 – Key Points
- No New Funding has been provided to K-12 or Community College Districts.
  - 2011-12 and 2012-13 Apportionment Budgets are held at the same level.
- The funding is short-term:
  - 4 years: .25% Sales Tax Increase
  - 7 years: Income Tax increase - $250,000 single / $500,000 joint
- Proposition 30 will generate an estimated $855 million for community colleges, more than the $355 million shortfall that it was expected to fill.
  - The balance of $500 million was allocated to other State agencies.
- The restrictions of Proposition 30 include:
  - Non-Administrative Costs Only – Includes Instruction and Student Services Salaries and Benefits
  - Annual Reporting, Annual Audit and Annual Public Disclosure
- The benefits of Proposition 30 include:
  - Budget reductions were averted and protected programs, staff and students.
  - Restored class sections that allowed approximately 78,000 FTES to be served.
Statewide Construction Bond

New Facilities for College of the Canyons

- California has not placed a statewide school facilities construction bond on the ballot since 2006.

- As a result, there is a $35.8 billion backlog in community college facilities needs awaiting funding.

- Assembly Bill 41 would authorize a statewide construction bond on the November 2014 ballot.
  - The funding level has not been determined. It will be dependent on the condition of the state budget and whether resources are available to fund bond repayments.
  - College of the Canyons could receive up to $67.9 million in funding from a statewide bond to support Canyon Country Campus projects.

- College of the Canyons has three Canyon Country Campus buildings on hold pending availability of state funding. (AB41)

  ✓ **Science Building**
    - 21,000 square feet, 2-story building
    - Provides 14,500 square feet of science teaching/learning space.
    - Includes 2,600 square feet of lecture space in 3 general assignment classrooms
    - 11,200 square feet of lab space in 7 classroom/labs, with 12 classroom/lab service rooms
    - 700 square feet of office space in 7 offices
✓ **Classroom & Student Resource Center**
  o 34,000-square-foot building, 3-story building
  o Will be the second permanent building constructed on Campus.
  o Multi-story building will contain student classrooms on the upper floors and house student service functions at the Main Plaza level
  o Will include 11,990 of general classroom space
  o 6,050 of computer lab space
  o 5,400 of student services office space
  o 2,800 of distance learning/media space
  o 1,560 of miscellaneous space
  o Library space in reading/study rooms

✓ **Instructional Building**
  o 21,000 square feet
  o Would provide additional classroom and office space.

- We will advocate for community colleges to receive 50 percent of the higher education allocation of bond funds, with 25 percent going to CSU, and 25 percent to UC.
  ✓ Community colleges serve 70 percent of public higher education enrollments in California.
  ✓ Previous splits were 1/3, 1/3, 1/3.

- Because most community college districts have local bond funds to match state allocations, construction projects are built quickly and efficiently.
  ✓ California Community College districts have passed $23 billion in local bonds since 2000.
  ✓ College of the Canyons has $45 million in bond funds available from Measure M, which local voters passed in 2006.
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Legislative Update
AB806 – Wilk

Community Colleges: Salaries of Classroom Instructors

- The bill would define "salaries of classroom instructors" to include the salaries of counselors.
- This bill would require that, commencing with the 2014-15 fiscal year, 52% of each district's current expense of education be expended for payment of salaries of classroom instructors, replacing the "50% law."
- Would also authorize the Board of Governors to establish a committee to review the auditing procedures in order to ensure compliance with the requirement and specify the makeup of the committee.
AB955 – Williams

Community Colleges: Intersession Extension Programs

- The bill would allow a community college district to maintain an extension program offering credit courses during summer and winter intersessions, which could include any courses that are part of a course of study leading to a certificate, degree, or transfer.
Facilities

AB41 - Buchanan
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2014

- This bill is one of a few “legislative intent bills” to place a statewide education facilities bond on an upcoming election ballot. Details of the bond measure are not yet included in Assembly Bill 41, and a similar bill, Senate Bill 45 (Corbett, D-San Leandro).
Instruction

SB 594 - Steinberg

Title: California Career Pathways Investment

- This bill authorizes three new financing tools for K-14 districts to encourage business participation in career pathways programs, which integrate academic and work-based learning to prepare students for both postsecondary education and careers in growing sectors of the economy.
- The bill would also create a committee chaired by the California Community Colleges Chancellor that would review applications and award credits to business-district partnerships that have the best chance of success and long-term sustainability.
This bill would establish The New University of California as a 4th segment of public postsecondary education in this state. Under AB 1306, the New University of California would provide no instruction, but issue college credit and baccalaureate and associate degrees to any person capable of passing examinations.
AB1348- Perez
Title: Postsecondary Education: California Higher Education Authority

- This bill would repeal the provisions establishing the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and would establish the California Higher Education Authority.
- The bill would also set forth the responsibilities of the authority relating to public and private postsecondary education in this state, including developing, presenting, and monitoring postsecondary education goals for the state and making recommendations about how to improve the performance of the postsecondary segments.
AB1358- Fong

Title: Student Body Association: Student Representation Fee

- This bill would allow a student representative fee of $2 per semester (current law is $1 per semester), and would require half of the student representation fee to be expended to establish and support the operations of an independent statewide community college student organization.
State Budget and Education Finance
AB283 – Bloom
Title: Community Colleges: Property Tax Revenues

- The bill would provide the California Community Colleges with an automatic property tax backfill when actual property taxes come in below projections.
- K-12 currently has this protection, but community colleges do not.
- So, as in recent years, when property tax receipts are less than what is budgeted, community colleges are hit with a mid-year revenue cut.
- These cuts are announced after colleges have budgeted, and often spent, the resources to offer classes and hire instructors.
State Budget and Education Finance

SCA 3 - Leno

Taxation: Educational Entities: Parcel Tax

- Would lower approval threshold from 2/3 to 55% of voters for the imposition, extension, or increase of a parcel tax.
- This has been a Democratic priority for several years, though the attempt has been derailed by the need for a 2/3 vote in both houses. With a Democratic supermajority, passage of this measure is now a possibility.
- Cosponsored by the (K-12) California School Boards Association.
Proposition 39 Legislation – Alternative Energy

BACKGROUND
Voters approved Prop 39 in November 2012, which requires out-of-state businesses to calculate their California income tax liability based on the percentage of their sales in California. It was expected to create approximately $1 billion in additional tax revenue. Of the revenue raised by this measure over the next five years, about half will be dedicated to energy efficiency and alternative energy projects. A significant portion of the remainder will likely be spent on public schools and community colleges. A number of bills have been introduced in the Legislature to specify the distribution of Prop. 39 funds.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS
• **AB 29 (Williams) Proposition 39: Implementation.** AB 29 creates a revolving loan fund for public higher education systems to use for energy efficiency retrofit projects. The author’s staff stated that this is spot language.

• **AB 39 (Skinner) Proposition 39: Implementation.** AB 39 creates an account for K-12 school districts to receive grants and other financial assistance for energy efficiency projects.

• **AB 114 (Salas) Proposition 39 Implementation.** AB 114 uses Proposition 39 funds for job training and workforce development by requiring the Employment Development Department to administer grants, no-interest loans, or other financial assistance for existing workforce programs to create green jobs. The bill also requires the California Conservation Corps, and other existing workforce programs to give higher priority to disadvantaged youth and veterans in economically distressed areas.

• **SB 35 (Pavley) Higher Education: Energy Conservation.** SB 35 requires the three segments of public higher education to develop and administer an energy plan for near and long-term strategies for energy efficiency.

• **SB 39 (De León) Energy Efficiency: School Facilities.** SB 39 appropriates funds to award energy efficiency grants to the most disadvantaged schools in need of modernization for energy efficiency upgrades.

• **SB 43 (Wolk) Renewable Energy: Shared Generation.** This bill states that it is the intent of the Legislature to create a shared, renewable energy self-generation program.

• **SB 64 (Corbett) Proposition 39: Implementation.** This bill states the intent of the Legislature to install clean energy at public schools, universities, and colleges, and at other public buildings and facilities consistent with the California Clean Energy Jobs Act.

• **SB 124 (Corbett) Public Contracts: Bid Preferences: Clean Energy.** This bill would require state agencies and the Trustees of the CSU to accept bids and proposals for a contract purchase or installation of a clean energy device, technology or system, to provide a 5% preference to a bidder that certifies that the parts and/or device were manufactured or assembled in the state.

• **SB 729 (Fuller) Proposition 39: Implementation.** SB 729 is a spot bill stating the intent to enact legislation to implement Proposition 39.