

AGENDA
ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2
ON EDUCATION FINANCE

Assemblymember Julia Brownley, Chair

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2007
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 126
4:00 P.M.

| ITEM | ITEMS TO BE HEARD | PAGE |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|
| 6870 | CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC) | 2 |
| ISSUE 1 | COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (INFORMATIONAL ITEM ONLY) | 2 |
| ISSUE 2 | SUPPORT BUDGET | 5 |
| ISSUE 3 | ENROLLMENT GROWTH FUNDING | 10 |
| ISSUE 4 | BASIC SKILLS FUNDING | 13 |
| ISSUE 5 | NONCREDIT FUNDING | 15 |
| 6610- 6870 | CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (CDE) / CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC) | 17 |
| ISSUE 1 | CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION | 17 |
| | ATTACHMENT 1 – STATUS REPORT – EL CAMINO COLLEGE – COMPTON COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL CENTER | 27 |

ITEM 6870 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC)**ISSUE 1: COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

Subcommittee members will hear from Compton's Special Trustee, Thomas Henry, on the status of the new Compton Community Educational Center.

BACKGROUND:**State Intervention**

In May 2004, the CCC Chancellor's Office issued Executive Order 2004-01 to initiate State intervention to resolve long-standing fiscal problems in the District and installed Dr. Arthur Tyler, Jr. as Special Trustee to assist the District toward achieving fiscal stability and integrity. The District had experienced a structural deficit, which was developed over time, with a projected ending fund balance for June 2006 of negative \$2.5 million. Subsequently, in August 2004, the Chancellor issued another Executive Order 2004-02 authorizing the continuing authority of the Special Trustee to manage the college, and to suspend, for up to one year, the powers of the governing board of the college, or of any members of that board, and to exercise any powers or responsibilities or to take any official action with respect to the management of the college.

Loss of Accreditation

In response to public information, the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) arrived on campus in late summer 2004 to mount an inquiry. The concerns of the ACCJC centered primarily on fiscal mismanagement and governance, with no question regarding the quality of the college's instructional programs.

In June 2005, the Commission notified Compton Community College that its accreditation would be terminated. In July 2005, the Chancellor assigned Dr. Charles Ratliff to serve as Special Trustee as the college appealed its loss of accreditation to the ACCJC. However, the accreditation appeal failed and the Commission moved to formally withdraw accreditation from the college in August 2006.

AB 318 (Dymally)

Last spring, this subcommittee approved a set-aside of \$30 million General Fund for a one-time bond-financed loan to the Compton Community College District to help address the District's fiscal solvency and the anticipated loss of program accreditation. These funds were allocated via AB 318 (Dymally), Chapter 50, Statutes of 2006.

Highlights of AB 318 include:

- An appropriation of \$30 million in one-time General Fund as an emergency apportionment. The loan is to be repaid from District apportionment with interest at the Pooled Money Investment Account rate over no more than 20 years. If the loan balance is subsequently financed through an Infrastructure Bank bond sale, the General Fund will be repaid the bond proceeds, and the bonds will be repaid from district apportionments.
- It requires that the Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) conduct an extraordinary audit of the District on or before October 30, 2006 and by January 31, 2007 prepare a recovery plan. It authorizes the CCC Board of Governors to suspend the authority of the District's Board of Trustees for up to five years plus a period of time until it has been determined, as specified, that the district has, for two consecutive academic years, met the requirements of the assessment and the recovery plan.
- It authorizes the appointment of a Special Trustee to do the following:
 1. Implement substantial changes in the fiscal policies and practices of the District.
 2. Revise the academic program of the District to reflect income projections.
 3. Enter into agreements on behalf of the District and change any district rules, regulations, policies, or practices as necessary for the effective implementation of the recovery plan.
 4. Appoint an Advisory Committee.
- It requires the District to identify a partner CCC district that would agree to provide accredited instructional programs to students residing in the District for a minimum of five years.

Thomas E. Henry was assigned to serve as the Special Trustee of the District in March 2006. AB 318 was signed into law by the Governor on June 30, 2006.

Partnership with El Camino Community College

In summer 2006, with the impending loss of accreditation, the Compton Community College District issued a request for proposal to partner with another community college district to continue to offer courses for credit on the Compton campus. The goal of the partnership was to provide the students and residents of Compton with access to accredited programs and services without interruption of instruction.

At the Compton CCD board meeting of August 22, 2006, the Special Trustee approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with El Camino Community College District to solidify the partnership between El Camino Community College District and Compton Community College District.

Under this MOU, the educational program offered on the Compton campus is provided under the auspices of El Camino College's accreditation. El Camino College Compton Center maintains its own faculty and classified labor units, an independent Associated Student Body organization, its own intercollegiate athletic teams, and separate public board meetings held by the Special Trustee. In issues of finance, the budget for the Compton Center is developed with input from the El Camino Community College District and approved by the Special Trustee of the Compton Community College District. There is an El Camino Community College District Academic Senate and a Compton Community College District Academic Senate. El Camino College's operational objective is to bring the Compton Center into good standing with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), with the understanding that campus functions will separate after full accreditation as a two-year public college has been restored. The intent of the agreement between the two districts is also to assist the Compton campus with fiscal recovery. El Camino College is providing accredited instructional and related support services, in addition to administrative services to meet the academic needs of Compton students.

COMMENTS:

The Special Trustee informed Budget staff that in 2006-07, \$7.8 million have been withdrawn from the \$30 million General Fund loan but that none of this funding has been apportioned yet.

Attachment 1 - Is the status report on El Camino College Compton Community Educational Center.

ISSUE 2: SUPPORT BUDGET

The issue for the subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposed budget for the California Community Colleges (CCC).

BACKGROUND:

The California Community Colleges provide instruction to about 1.6 million students at 109 campuses operated by 72 locally governed districts throughout the State. The CCC offer academic, occupational, and recreational programs at the lower division-freshman and sophomore level. Based on agreements with local school districts, some college districts offer a variety of adult education programs. In addition, pursuant to State law, many colleges have established programs intended to promote regional economic development.

The Governor's proposal would increase total Proposition 98 funding (General Fund and local property taxes) for CCC by \$377 million, or 6.4 percent, over the revised current-year estimate. This augmentation funds a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) of 4.04 percent, enrollment growth of 2 percent, a fee-reduction backfill, and several program expansions. Counting all fund sources—including student fee revenue and federal and local funds, the CCC's budget would total \$8.6 billion in 2007-08.

| California Community Colleges: Governor's Budget Proposal (Proposition 98 Spending) | |
|--|------------------|
| <i>(In Millions)</i> | |
| 2006-07 (Enacted) | \$5,885.0 |
| Increase for nursing education programs | \$9.0 |
| Increase for California Partnership for Achieving Student Success | 1.0 |
| Local property tax adjustment | 4.0 |
| Lease-purchase payment reduction | -2.0 |
| 2006-07 (Estimated) | \$5,897.0 |
| Proposed Budget-Year Augmentations | |
| Cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for apportionments | \$224.9 |
| Enrollment growth for apportionments | 109.1 |
| COLA and enrollment growth for categorical programs | 19.6 |
| Current year fee reduction backfill | 33.2 |
| Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team | 0.3 |
| Subtotal | (\$387.1) |
| Proposed Budget-Year Reductions | |
| Lease-purchase payments | -\$2.5 |
| Adjustment for revised fee estimates | -1.3 |
| Technical adjustments | -6.2 |
| Subtotal | (-\$10.0) |
| 2007-08 (Proposed) | \$6,274.1 |

MAJOR BUDGET PROPOSALS:

BUDGET YEAR

Proposition 98. The Governor's budget includes \$6.3 billion in Proposition 98 funding for CCC in 2007-08. This is almost three-quarters of total community college funding. Overall, Proposition 98 provides funding of approximately \$57 billion in support of K-12 education, CCC, and several state agencies. As proposed by the Governor, CCC would receive 11 percent of total Proposition 98 funding. This is slightly higher than its statutory share, which is 10.9 percent of total Proposition 98 appropriations. In recent years, this provision has been suspended in the annual budget act and CCC's share of Proposition 98 funding has been somewhat lower than 10.9 percent. The CCC's share of Proposition 98 funding in the current year is 10.7 percent. In order to provide an amount different from the 10.9 percent specified in statute, the Administration proposes again to suspend this provision.

| Community College Budget Summary | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i> | | | | | |
| | Actual 2005-06 | Estimated 2006-07 | Proposed 2007-08 | Change From 2006-07 | |
| | | | | Amount | Percent |
| Community College Proposition 98 | | | | | |
| General Fund | \$3,669.7 | \$4,039.6 | \$4,223.6 | \$184.0 | 4.6% |
| Local property tax | 1,802.7 | 1,857.4 | 2,050.5 | 193.1 | 10.4 |
| Subtotals, Proposition 98 | (\$5,472.4) | (\$5,897.0) | (\$6,274.1) | (\$377.1) | (6.4%) |
| Other Funds | | | | | |
| General Fund | (\$264.8) | (\$293.3) | (\$278.6) | (\$14.7) | (-5.0%) |
| Proposition 98 Reversion Account | 35.6 | 22.3 | — | -22.3 | -100.0 |
| State operations | 9.2 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| Teachers' retirement | 82.2 | 83.0 | 82.0 | -1.0 | -1.2 |
| Bond payments | 137.8 | 148.3 | 187.3 | 39.0 | 26.3 |
| Loan for Compton CCD ^a | — | 30.0 | — | -30.0 | -100.0 |
| Compton CCD ^a Loan Payback | — | — | -0.6 | -0.6 | — |
| State lottery funds | 177.9 | 173.9 | 173.9 | — | — |
| Other state funds | 13.3 | 13.9 | 13.7 | -0.2 | -1.4 |
| Student fees | 344.9 | 321.7 | 281.9 | -39.8 | -12.4 |
| Federal funds | 249.8 | 267.0 | 267.0 | — | — |
| Other local funds | 1,241.7 | 1,326.9 | 1,326.9 | — | — |
| Subtotals, other funds | (\$2,292.4) | (\$2,396.7) | (\$2,342.0) | (\$54.7) | (-2.3%) |
| Grand Totals | \$7,764.8 | \$8,293.7 | \$8,616.1 | \$322.4 | 3.9% |
| ^a Community college district. Detail may not total due to rounding. | | | | | |

Proposition 98 Spending by Major Program. As shown in the table below, apportionment funding, which is available to districts to spend on general purposes such as salaries, equipment, and supplies, accounts for \$5.6 billion in 2007-08, an increase of \$360 million, or 6.9 percent, from the current year. Apportionment funding in the budget year accounts for about 89 percent of CCC's total Proposition 98 expenditures.

| Major Community College Programs Funded by Proposition 98^a | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------|
| <i>(Dollars in Millions)</i> | | | | |
| | Estimated 2006-07 | Proposed 2007-08 | Change | |
| | | | Amount | Percent |
| Apportionments | | | | |
| General Fund | \$3,347.4 | \$3,513.8 | \$166.4 | 5.0% |
| Local property tax revenue | 1,857.4 | 2,050.5 | 193.1 | 10.4 |
| Subtotals | (\$5,204.8) | (\$5,564.3) | (\$359.5) | (6.9%) |
| Categorical Programs | | | | |
| Basic skills overcap ^b | \$33.1 | — | -\$33.1 | 100.0% |
| Matriculation ^b | 95.5 | \$134.4 | 38.9 | 40.7 |
| Career technical education | 20.0 | 20.0 | — | — |
| Nursing | 25.9 | 25.9 | — | — |
| Extended Opportunity Programs and Services | 112.9 | 119.8 | 6.9 | 6.1 |
| Disabled Students | 107.9 | 114.5 | 6.6 | 6.1 |
| Apprenticeships | 15.2 | 15.2 | — | — |
| Services for CalWORKs ^c recipients | 43.6 | 43.6 | — | — |
| Part-time faculty compensation | 50.8 | 50.8 | — | — |
| Part-time faculty office hours | 7.2 | 7.2 | — | — |
| Part-time faculty health insurance | 1.0 | 1.0 | — | — |
| Physical plant and instructional support | 27.3 | 27.3 | — | — |
| Economic development program | 46.8 | 46.8 | — | — |
| Telecommunications and technology services | 26.2 | 26.2 | — | — |
| Financial aid/outreach | 52.6 | 51.3 | -1.3 | -2.5 |
| Child care funds for students | 6.5 | 6.8 | 0.3 | 4.0 |
| Foster Parent Training Program | 4.8 | 4.8 | — | — |
| Fund for Student Success | 6.2 | 6.2 | — | — |
| Other programs | 8.7 | 8.0 | -0.7 | -8.0 |
| Subtotals, categorical programs | (\$692.2) | (\$709.8) | (\$17.6) | (2.5%) |
| Totals | \$5,897.0 | \$6,274.1 | \$377.1 | 6.4% |
| <p>^a Excludes available funding appropriated in prior fiscal years.</p> <p>^b Governor proposes to permanently redirect basic skills overcap funding to matriculation in 2007-08 as part of his "student success initiative."</p> <p>^c California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids.</p> | | | | |

Student Fees. The Governor proposes no change to the existing student fee level of \$20 per unit.

Student Fee Reduction Backfill. The Governor's budget provides an increase of \$33.2 million to offset the remaining student fee revenue reduction incurred by lowering student fees from \$26 to \$20 per unit last year. The *2006-07 Budget Act* included \$40 million in Proposition 98 ongoing funds to backfill the student fee revenue loss for the spring semester in the current year since the fee reduction became effective on January 1, 2007. The increase is needed to cover the full year cost of the reduction in 2007-08.

Enrollment Growth. The Governor's budget provides \$109.1 million in Proposition 98 General Fund for enrollment growth. This represents a two percent enrollment growth to provide access for an additional 23,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES).

General Purpose Cost-of-Living-Adjustment (COLA). The Governor's budget proposes \$224.9 million in Proposition 98 General Fund for a 4.04 percent COLA for general purpose apportionments for all districts.

Growth and COLA for Categorical Programs. The Governor's budget proposes a \$19.6 million increase for categorical program enrollment growth (2 percent) and COLA (4.04 percent).

Local Property Tax Revenue. The Governor's budget proposes a \$197.2 million reduction to CCC apportionments to reflect the estimated growth in local property taxes of an identical amount.

CURRENT YEAR

Property Tax Revenue. The Governor's budget includes a \$4.1 million increase in property tax revenue based on revised estimates.

Student Fee Revenue. The Governor's proposed budget includes a \$6.6 million estimated increase in fee revenue reflecting an increase in the average number of credit units taken per FTES.

ISSUE 3: ENROLLMENT GROWTH FUNDING

The issue for the subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposal to increase the community colleges enrollment by \$109.1 million, or 2 percent, to fund an additional 23,000 FTES.

BACKGROUND:

The CCC is the nation's largest system of higher education currently comprised of 72 districts, 109 campuses, 64 approved educational centers, and 20 separately reported district offices. All the colleges offer academic and occupational programs at the lower-division-freshman and sophomore level. Based on agreements with local school districts, some college districts offer a variety of adult education programs including basic skills education, citizenship instruction, and vocational and recreational programs. In addition, pursuant to State law, many colleges have established programs intended to promote regional economic development. Community colleges educate the most diverse student population in the State providing services to more than 2.5 million students during academic year 2005-06.

COMMENTS:**2006-07 Enrollment Funding**

In the 2007-08 Analysis of the Budget Bill, the LAO states that recent annual budgets have provided community colleges with more enrollment funding than they have been able to use.

According to the LAO, CCC unused enrollment funding can be accounted due to the following:

- **Declining Enrollment.** State law allows districts experiencing declining enrollment to retain enrollment funding for vacant slots in the year they become vacant in order to cushion district budgets from year-to-year enrollment volatility. However, if these slots remained unfilled a second year, the districts lose these "stability" funds. The funds remain in the CCC base budget for three years and are available to "restore" the enrollment base of districts that regain lost enrollment within a three-year period. As a result of declining enrollments in the last three years, the LAO states that these districts are entitled to "earn back" up to \$161 million in enrollment restoration funding to the extent that new students fill the vacant slots in the current year. Expecting better enrollment estimates by May Revision, the LAO believes that approximately half of the restoration funds (\$80 million) could be scored as savings to fund other priorities.

- ***New Enrollment Growth Funding.*** Last year, the Legislature approved \$97.5 million, or 2 percent, for enrollment growth in the current year. Based on their projections, the LAO believes that the districts will not be able to use all of this funding. A better estimate of the enrollment growth in the current year will be available by May Revise.

The CCC Chancellor's Office states that, although the districts experienced enrollment growth from 1998-99 through 2001-02, unfunded growth, budget cuts, and fee increases—from \$11 to \$18 to \$26 per unit—had an impact on student enrollments.

In 2005-06, enrollment trends were mixed across the state with some districts growing in FTES and other districts declining. Although CCC base funding was stabilizing, course sections were restored, all FTES were funded, the \$26 per unit fee continued to keep some students away. In addition, a smaller cohort of first-time students from prior years (2003-04 and (2004-05) meant that the cohort of continuing students was smaller in 2005-06.

Actual enrollments for 2006-07 are difficult to predict due to the following factors:

- Under State regulations, Districts have until November 1, 2007, to decide whether summer session FTES will be reported for 2006-07 or for the 2007-08.
- CCC enrollment is affected by the ups and downs of the local labor markets. When there are jobs available, students may choose not to attend a CCC or opt to take fewer courses. When jobs are scarce, CCC experience growth from individuals seeking job training and skills upgrading.
- Growth in 2006-07 for roughly half of the districts will actually be recovery growth from prior enrollment decline.

2007-08 Enrollment Growth Funding

The budget proposal provides an increase of \$109 million, or 2 percent, for enrollment growth in 2007-08 to fund about 23,000 additional FTES. With this augmentation, the Governor's budget proposes funding a total of about 1.2 million FTES in 2007-08.

The LAO's projections estimate that the districts will need 1.1 percent enrollment growth funding in the budget year. The LAO is recommending that the Legislature fund 1.65 percent enrollment growth, instead of a 2 percent growth as proposed, for a savings of \$19 million in Proposition 98 ongoing funds.

The CCC Chancellor's Office states that they expect that most districts that were in decline will begin to experience growth in 2007-08. This trend is also expected due to the reduced \$20 per unit fee, which will be in effect for an entire fiscal year in the budget year.

DOF will be reviewing enrollment projections and may include enrollment growth funding changes by May Revision. Last year, DOF submitted in May Revise a proposal to reduce the CCC apportionment by \$85 million to reflect unused enrollment growth funding of an identical amount, thus re-benching base apportionments on an ongoing basis. The Legislature approved this proposal and the funds were used to fund other priorities.

ISSUE 4: BASIC SKILLS FUNDING

The issue for the subcommittee to consider is the Governor's proposal to permanently redirect \$33.1 million of surplus Basic Skills over-cap incentive funding to support matriculation and support services.

BACKGROUND:

Basic skills consist of a course, a course of study, or a sequence of courses to provide instruction for individuals in elementary and secondary-level reading, writing, computation and problem-solving skills. Courses include English-language arts, math, arts, science, social sciences, technology/computer literacy, workforce preparation, and problem solving and life skills. Students' goals may include basic skills certificate of competency, high school diploma, workforce readiness, effective parenting and general education development (GED) exam preparation.

Basic Skills Overcap

The budget for the community college system includes a specified amount of funding for enrollment growth. Growing districts use this funding to accommodate additional students above their previous year's level. Using an allocation formula, the Chancellor's Office determines the amount of growth funding available to each district. This "growth cap" sets the ceiling for how many students the State will fund in the district in a given year. In recent years, districts that enrolled above this cap level risked not receiving funding for those students. An exception was created for districts with overcap growth in basic skills courses. Districts must meet certain requirements to qualify for basic skills overcap funding.

2005-06 / 2006-07 Basic Skills Overcap

In the *2006-07 Budget Act*, the Legislature authorized the following:

- A redirection of \$30.7 million (Item 6870-493) in unused basic skills funds in 2005-06 to be used, on a one-time basis, for enhancements of these same programs as well as immigrant education programs including, but not limited to, curriculum development, course articulation, research, professional development, instructional equipment, counseling and tutoring. Of this amount, \$750,000 was appropriated for basic skills research and facilitation at the Chancellor's Office, and \$29.9 million was allocated to districts for basic skills enhancement based on basic skills FTES.
- A redirection of 2006-07 unused basic skills funds (Item 6870-101-0001-Provision 9 and 10) to be used, on a one-time basis, for enhancements of these same programs as well as immigrant education

programs including, but not limited to, curriculum development, course articulation, research, professional development, instructional equipment, counseling and tutoring.

2007-08 Basic Skills Overcap

The Governor's budget proposes a \$33.1 million redirection of surplus Basic Skills over-cap incentive funding to support additional matriculation and support services. According to the Administration, these funds are currently dedicated for student instruction that exceeds district funding limits and are not projected to be needed in the foreseeable future. Instead, the Administration is proposing to use this amount to help the most at-risk first-time students that are in transition from high school to define and complete specific academic goals. Of the \$33.1 million, the Administration is proposing to use \$14 million for additional matriculation services, which include orientation, counseling and academic assessment, and referrals to specialized services, and \$19.1 million to be used for targeted counseling services to help student's assess career options, evaluate aptitudes and form an academic plan of study.

COMMENTS:

Double Funding Basic Skills in the 2006-07

According to the LAO, in addition to the re-appropriated basic skills funding from the prior year (2005-06), the current-year budget (2006-07) also includes \$33.1 million in base funding for overcap basic skills enrollment. Provisional language redirects any funds not needed for overcap enrollment to basic skills enhancements. Given that no districts are expected to be over cap in the current year, these monies will essentially double the basic skills initiative funding.

The LAO therefore recommends that the Legislature reduce, on a one-time basis, current-year appropriation of Proposition 98 funding by \$33.1 million. This action would avoid double funding the basic skills initiative and would have no effect on the number of basic skills students served.

Basic Skills Overcap 2007-08 Proposal

While the LAO believes that the Governor's proposal to eliminate the basic skills overcap categorical has merit, they recommend that the Legislature use the \$33.1 million in one-time savings as needed to reduce Proposition 98 spending in the budget year. If Legislature chooses to retain these funds in the CCC's budget, the LAO recommends that this funding be provided as block grants to a targeted group of community colleges to be used to improve student achievement and completion rates.

ISSUE 5: NONCREDIT FUNDING

The issue for the subcommittee to consider is the CCC's system budget request of \$30 million to enhance the rate funding for career development and college preparation noncredit courses.

BACKGROUND:

Who are noncredit students? The majority of noncredit students are among the least academically prepared and come from disadvantaged backgrounds. These are students that were unsuccessful in high school, who need more training for job advancement, who want to have a vocational trade and who need to develop their basic skills to complete collegiate level work.

Courses. Noncredit funding supports courses that do not provide students with credit towards postsecondary degrees and include the following:

- Basic skills or remedial courses in reading, math, and language arts
- English as a Second Language (ESL)
- Citizenship
- Parenting classes in child growth and development
- Short-term vocational programs
- Education programs for older adults
- Education programs for persons with disabilities

Colleges Offering Noncredit Courses. Out of 109 community colleges, 105 offer some noncredit education. Some have very small programs, while a few are quite large. In terms of total noncredit enrollments, the eight largest community college districts with their percentage of total FTES noncredit enrollment are: San Diego Community College District (25 percent), North Orange CCD (20 percent), Rancho Santiago CCD (32 percent), San Francisco CCD (35 percent), Mt. San Antonio CCD (22 percent), Santa Barbara CCD (15 percent), Glendale CCD (21 percent) and Sonoma CCD (17 percent). Together, their programs constitute approximately 63 percent of noncredit enrollments.

Noncredit Funding. The *2006-07 Budget Act* provided \$30 million in Proposition 98 ongoing funds to enhance funding for noncredit courses in basic skills. This funding was appropriated to the CCC system via SB 361 (Scott), Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006, which provided that, beginning 2006-07, noncredit instruction be funded at a rate of \$2,626 per FTES. Prior to SB 361, noncredit courses were funded at \$2,164 per FTES. SB 361 included that for selected noncredit courses, or Career Development and College Preparation courses that are a part of a sequence leading into a career technical education or a college preparatory path, the rate per FTES may be funded at \$3,092. In addition, SB 361 required the development of criteria and standards to establish the eligibility of courses for this augmented funding.

At their September 2006 meeting, the BOG approved a \$30 million budget request for Career Development and College Preparation courses but was not included in the 2007-08 Governor's budget.

| |
|------------------|
| COMMENTS: |
|------------------|

The Chancellor's Office budget staff will provide an update on the approval and implementation of the regulations, identification of selected noncredit courses and allocation of the \$30 million in the current year.

**ITEM 6610-6870 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (CDE) /
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC)****ISSUE 1: CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

The issue for the subcommittee to consider is the Governor's budget proposal of \$52 million Proposition 98 General Fund (\$20 million ongoing and \$32 one-time) to fund career technical education in 2007-08.

BACKGROUND:

The Governor launched the Career Technical Education (CTE) Initiative in 2005. That year, the Governor proposed and the Legislature approved \$20 million in one-time Proposition 98 Reversion Account funds to encourage high schools to work with community colleges to expand and improve vocational courses offered to high school students. According to the Administration, this funding, which became available on January 1, 2006 through SB 70 (Scott), has been allocated through grants for the CCC to support several types of projects including "Quick Start" Partnerships, which enhance linkages and pathways between secondary schools and selected economic and workforce development initiatives, programs that can grow program capacity and infrastructure and projects that strengthen career technical education sectors at secondary schools. Last year, the Governor proposed \$50 million in Proposition 98 ongoing funds to support his CTE Initiative. The Legislature reduced the funding to \$20 million since the CCC Chancellor's Office had only been able to allocate \$10.8 million from the previous \$20 million one-time allocation.

The Governor's budget proposes \$52 million to expand career technical education course offerings and programs. Of this amount, \$20 million are Proposition 98 ongoing funds appropriated to the CCC's base budget last year and \$32 million is new funding provided in SB 1133, Chapter 751, Statutes of 2006. The \$32 million in one-time funds would increase to \$38 million annually in 2008-09 through 2013-14 for a total annual fund of \$58 million, including the \$20 million ongoing funds already in the base.

COMMENTS:**LAO ANALYSIS**

Senate Bill 70 established a program to “improve linkages and career-technical education pathways between high schools and community colleges.” These “pathways” are designed to help high school students develop vocational skills needed by employers in the area while also preparing students for more-advanced academic or vocational coursework in a community college or university.

SB 70 authorized several types of activities:

- Creating new or aligning existing high school and community college technical preparation programs and curriculum.
- Expanding or promoting community college training programs.
- Testing new program models.
- Improving career-related middle school or high school programs, such as career exploration programs.

The Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges and the California Department of Education (CDE) jointly administer the act. Funds are allocated through a competitive grant process in which all community colleges are invited to apply. Local projects are jointly developed by community colleges and K-12 entities (high schools and Regional Occupational Centers or Programs [ROC/Ps]). Most local projects also are required to involve local business. Grants typically provide short-term improvement funding to develop or strengthen CTE programs, rather than ongoing operational support.

2005-06 CTE Grants (\$20 million one-time)

In the program’s first year, \$15.3 million of the \$20 million annual appropriation was targeted at creating new or improving existing CTE programs (\$13.8 million) or developing middle school career exploration and counseling programs (\$1.5 million). Several of the grants build on strong existing relationships among businesses and educators to develop regional approaches to improving vocational education programs. Other grants propose to coordinate the California Community College (CCC) and K-12 programs so closely that students can earn college credits for high-level CTE courses taken in high school.

According to the Chancellor's Office, all \$20 million in one-time funds have already been allocated.

2005-06 CTE Grants (\$20 million ongoing)

In 2005-06, funds were concentrated in four areas: (1) strengthening or creating local career technical pathways, (2) developing middle-school exploration course curricula, (3) supporting region-wide course articulation, and (4) funding teacher/faculty in-service activities. In 2006-07, the emphasis on local pathways was reduced and new grants were available for other types of "system development" activities, such as establishing a vocational education teacher "pipeline," articulation between community colleges and four-year universities, and linking CCC economic development programs to CTE programs.

The Chancellor's Office stated to Budget staff that they are currently working in allocating the \$20 million in ongoing funds for the current year. They have already received applications for competitive grants to account for \$10 to \$15 million out of the \$20 million allocation. The last \$5 million will be allocated by the end of June 2007.

2007-08 CTE Expenditure Plan

In 2007-08, the budget proposes a wide variety of new programs. Most significantly, the budget would distribute on a formula basis \$20 million for local improvement grants. According to the Chancellor's office, funds would be distributed to each of the 72 community college districts. Funds would be available for a wide variety of local activities, including aligning curriculum with the State's CTE standards, planning and implementing new partnership academies, and sequencing secondary and post-secondary vocational education courses. The budget also proposes a significant number of new grant programs. The budget would establish 16 new programs. All told, the proposal would fund 239 separate contracts, according to the Chancellor's Office. In 2005-06, only 69 contracts were proposed under SB 70. Thus, the large budget-year increase in funding appears to be generating an even larger increase in the number of contracts that are proposed.

LAO CONCERNS

Coordination Problems at all Levels

- ***Middle School Foundation Skills.*** Middle school provides the foundation for many CTE programs. One part of this foundation is a program of career exploration and counseling that helps students think about careers and the options available to them in high school and college. The second component to the foundation is pre-requisite academic or vocational skills that are needed for high school CTE programs.

District applications for SB 70 funds often acknowledged that one or both of these foundational elements is missing in their middle schools. For instance, several of the applications noted the absence of any counseling program for their middle school students. One large urban district provided college counseling, but not career counseling. Several applications also noted the lack of vocational or academic preparation needed to participate in high-level high school CTE programs. For instance, a biotech pathway project noted that science programs in middle school were inadequate to prepare students for the program. Another project cited the need for introductory middle school vocational classes that would help students “understand and experience the personal connection between what is taught in the classroom and its relation to the real world.”

- ***Coordination Between K-12, CCC, and CSU.*** A number of projects cited a lack of coordination between K-12 and CCC vocational programs. Interestingly, sometimes the high school and ROC/P had an exemplary program for which no complementary CCC program existed to help take students to higher skill levels. In other cases, the community college operated a high-level program that lacked a quality secondary “feeder” program from the high school and ROC/P.

Grant applications suggest a similar lack of coordination can occur among community colleges and CSU campuses. At least two proposals included a CSU campus as part of the grant participants—but the CSU was located 100 miles from the high schools and community college that were leading the project. In each case, another CSU campus was located nearer the high school and community college but did not participate in the project. Clearly, involving the local CSU campus would seem a better arrangement for students.

- **Education-Business Coordination.** Failure to fulfill the manpower needs of business represents another coordination problem, one between education agencies and the local employer communities. In several grants, the local Workforce Investment Board (WIB) played a major role in assessing the needs of local employers and convening the business and education communities to address those needs. Local WIBs administer job training programs under the federal Workforce Investment Act. Since both community colleges and ROC/Ps are required to maintain employer advisory boards, the role played by the local WIB suggests these boards are not always effective in communicating the needs and interests of a broad range of employers in the region.

PROGRAM NEEDS TO DEFINE LONG TERM GOALS

According to the LAO, the administration's approach reflects two major problems:

1. First, the agencies have not identified specific long-term goals for the program. Without such goals, there is no framework for determining annual spending priorities or for evaluating the impact of chosen strategies. Instead, the budget presents a long list of programs that are based on unclear goals and priorities and no expectation of what statewide outcomes the programs will produce. While the LAO understands the logic and relevance of most of the proposed uses of funds, they do not see how these pieces fit into a broader plan for the revitalization of the State's CTE programs.
2. Most significantly, the agencies have not described what a "good" CTE program looks like at the local level. This would help define the long-term objectives of SB 70. How many pathways should be available to high school students? What are the state's goals for the pathways—higher wages for those students who work, greater numbers enrolling in community college CTE programs, more students enrolling in four-year programs? Without this long-term foundation, it is difficult to evaluate the rationale for the various programs proposed in the budget. Perhaps more critically, without an idea of where the program should be headed, it is unlikely to reach that goal.

COMPETITIVE GRANTS POSE PROBLEMS

Another problem with the current approach is the heavy use of competitive grants to support the local improvement process.

The competitive grant process implicitly assumes that the Chancellor's Office and CDE have enough information and insight to fine tune the improvement process from Sacramento. The budget plan for 2007-08, with its many small grant programs, seems to suggest the two agencies know exactly what types of improvements are needed around the State. Because the agencies are working without a clear statement of goals, however, it is unclear whether the list of proposed programs represents a reasonable implementation plan.

Using competitive grants to promote statewide reform of CTE also suggests that deep involvement of the State agencies is necessary for the local improvement process to succeed. The LAO suggests the contrary—that improving CTE is mostly a local process that needs strong local commitment to succeed. As discussed above, improving CTE involves coordinating education, business, and labor to ensure all elements needed for successful programs are in place. From this perspective, therefore, competitive grants represent the wrong approach to building these local relationships.

Heavy reliance on competitive grants results in the following:

- **Limited Scope of the Projects.** Revitalizing CTE through the development of pathways will require a major effort by employers and educators to develop and implement new vocational options. A significant number of the approved projects, however, propose programs that will involve only a few students in specialized occupational areas. These projects typically involve one or two high schools, one community college, and one or two employers. If there were already a robust system of vocational options in all parts of the State, adding these small pathways would make sense as a way to meet the particular needs of local employers and further expand student choices. Given the desire to make high quality vocational options available to most high school students, however, the LAO believe that the State would be better served by focusing SB 70 funding on larger regional projects that would expand CTE options for a greater number of students.

Similarly, the grants also frequently limit the scope of participating groups. Despite the fact that each grant has a community college and K-12 sponsor, many grants do not include major local K-12 entities that are crucial to the success of the project. Many grants, for instance, do not include either high schools or ROC/Ps as direct participants. Many grants also exclude middle schools as participants. Given the importance of each level of education in creating successful CTE programs, the LAO believes that the State should encourage local improvement projects to include all of these entities.

- **Competitive Grants Help Only the Winners.** Competitive grants are useful in creating competition that helps the State obtain the highest value for its dollar. For SB 70, however, the LAO does not see the value of the colleges competing with one another. Improving CTE is a statewide goal—all parts of the State should participate. In addition, competitive grants tend to favor areas that can afford talented grant writers who develop high-scoring projects. As a consequence, the competitive grant process may make it difficult for some regions to win grants to improve local programs.

Similarly, friction between local community colleges and K-12 entities may make agreement on joint projects difficult to reach. While the competitive grant approach may, in some cases, create sufficient financial incentives for these agencies to work together, it also allows areas of the state to opt out of the improvement process. According to the LAO, SB 70 should be a tool to help reduce friction between these agencies. The program should provide the business community, parents, and other local officials and community members with leverage to get the educational agencies to work cooperatively to meet the needs of students. The competitive grant process doesn't provide much standing for these other groups to generate the local pressure needed to break through such obstacles. Thus, the Legislature should consider a different approach to strengthening local CTE programs.

- **Addressing Special Needs of Rural Areas.** Issues faced by rural areas illustrate another problem with using a competitive grant process for the local improvement process. Only 5 of the 35 approved projects for expanding or improving existing pathways were located in rural parts of the State. The LAO believes that there are several possible reasons for this rate of participation. First, some areas of the State have no local community college within a reasonable distance. Since proposals could be submitted only by community colleges, the process made it difficult for some rural areas to apply. Second, while the emphasis on connections with employers is a critical factor in successful CTE programs, rural areas often have few major employers to work with. In these cases, it is hard to see how rural areas can compete for grants with parts of the State where large employers are located.

The lack of community colleges and major employers illustrate the types of problems facing rural areas as they attempt to upgrade local CTE programs. As a result, a traditional pathway approach may not work in many rural communities. Rather than create a grant program specifically for rural areas, it makes more sense to encourage each area to develop local solutions to upgrading local CTE programs. These solutions may require some “out of the box” thinking. Are there innovative solutions that allow high schools and ROC/Ps to work with community colleges that are 100 miles away? Should the State authorize ROC/Ps to provide community college courses in areas that would otherwise be underserved? The LAO believes that SB 70 should work under the assumption that improving CTE programs in different parts of the State may require different solutions than are offered in the existing grant programs.

- **Is Coordination a One-Time Activity?** Although SB 70 grants provide one-time funding, a number of projects use the grants for ongoing operational costs. One grant, for example, used funds to support a summer program for middle and high school students. The project acknowledged that this component was not sustainable without new funds. This does not represent a prudent use of SB 70 funds.

Sustainability is an important issue, but in another sense. The “one-time” costs of virtually all the SB 70 projects are not really one-time activities. Instead, coordination is needed on an ongoing basis to update programs as business practices change, modernize equipment, align courses, and train teachers and faculty. Viewing them as one-time activities suggests that the updating done by SB 70 will erode in effectiveness over time—leaving future CTE programs with the same problems SB 70 is addressing. If the core of SB 70 is building relationships, maintaining these relationships as people and programs change over time represents part of the ongoing process of maintaining CTE programs.

LAO RECOMMENDATION

The LAO is recommending that Legislature enact legislation directing most of the \$52 million proposed for SB 70 to pay for the first year of a seven-year grant program that would support a comprehensive program of improvement at the county or regional level. Grants would be determined on a formula basis, so that all parts of the State would participate in the program. The regional partnerships would be guided by a plan that would be developed during 2007-08 that assessed the current status of career tech and described the region’s approach to improving CTE.

The plans would constitute a regional “master plan” for the improvement of career technical education. The K-12 entities, community colleges, and four-year universities in the region would participate in the development of the plan. To ensure the broad participation of business interests, the LAO recommends including the local WIB in the collaborative. They also suggest inviting the participation of labor organizations so that apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs are included in the coordination process.

The LAO's proposed legislation also would identify the program elements that would be included in the local plans, such as:

- **Middle School Foundation.** Plans would include a middle school component so that students get the counseling and other prerequisite courses needed for success in high school and college.
- **High School-Community College Coordination.** Each region's plan would create a sufficient number of CTE options to allow each high school to offer at least two vocational choices. These options could be pathways, tech-prep sequences, or other options that help students develop both academically and vocationally. The plan also would describe how the region plans to sequence high school, ROC/P, and community college CTE courses. Once the basic structure of pathways and sequencing is in place, regions also would be free to develop more specialized sequences based on needs of employers and student interest.
- **Coordination Among CCC and Four-Year Universities.** The pathways and sequences would be incomplete if they did not extend into the public four-year universities. Involving the CSU campuses is critical because it accepts many more CCC transfer students than the University of California.
- **Other Uses of Funds.** The grant money would support the different coordination activities discussed above. In addition, grant funds could be spent on a wide variety of other goods and services, such as materials and equipment, in-service training, summer internships for both teachers and students, and research or evaluation.

The LAO's proposal would distribute funds based on the number of high school students in the region. The table below illustrates the amounts that this proposal would provide to selected counties if these counties were established as regions. As the table shows, even the grants to smaller counties accumulate to large sums over the seven-year time frame. The table also shows that the LAO's formula distributes only \$47 million of the \$52 million in funds that are proposed in the budget year. The LAO's proposal would set aside the other \$5 million for State-level grants.

| LAO Proposed Regional CTE^a Grants Selected County Allocations | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>(In Millions)</i> | | |
| | 2007-08 | Seven-Year Total |
| Alameda | \$1.6 | \$12.4 |
| Butte | 0.3 | 2.1 |
| Contra Costa | 1.3 | 9.8 |
| Los Angeles | 12.6 | 97.6 |
| Mendocino | 0.1 | 0.9 |
| Orange | 3.8 | 29.8 |
| Sacramento | 1.8 | 13.8 |
| San Diego | 3.7 | 29.0 |
| Santa Clara | 1.8 | 14.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 0.3 | 2.3 |

^a Career Technical Education.

The LAO also recommends that the Legislature include in legislation performance measures for the regional partnerships that indicate the impact of the improvement process on students. Indicators could include the number of high school students (1) enrolled in a high school career pathway or other sequence of CTE courses and (2) who successfully complete a pathway or other sequence of CTE courses. The LAO also suggests that legislation require partnerships to collect data on the number of high school graduates who participated in a pathway or sequence (1) who attend college or a university with the goal of getting a four-year degree and (2) who enroll in community college with the goal of getting a vocational degree. Finally, data on wages earned by students who worked after high school also would be useful outcome data on the value of the pathways.

ATTACHMENT 1

STATUS REPORT

EL CAMINO COLLEGE COMPTON COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL CENTER



STATUS REPORT

EL CAMINO COLLEGE COMPTON COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL CENTER

PREPARED BY:

**Thomas E. Henry, Special Trustee
Compton Community College District
April 11, 2007**

BACKGROUND

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) found that Compton Community College did not meet accreditation standards, and moved to formally withdraw accreditation from the college in August 2006. The district has worked to provide uninterrupted educational services for the students by partnering with another accredited community college, the El Camino Community College.

On June 30, 2006, Assembly Bill 318 was signed into law. AB 318 provided a state loan of \$30 million to the Compton Community College District. The legislation also required the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team to conduct an extraordinary audit and a comprehensive assessment of the district in five operational areas and to develop a recovery plan for the district to implement. FCMAT is required to file written status reports at regular intervals on the district's progress in implementing the recovery plan.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated January 22, 2007, outlines the agreement between the Compton Community College District and the El Camino Community College District. The MOU establishes the El Camino College Compton Community Educational Center operated under the direct management of El Camino College through a Provost who reports to the Superintendent/President of El Camino College for all operational aspects of the Compton Center including its instructional programs, student services, business services and other programs and services. The Provost also reports to the Special Trustee for the Compton Community College District, as Chief Executive Officer with respect to responsibilities for the budget, including the payroll, and for the employees of the Compton Community College District.

FCMAT's work with the Compton Community College District and the El Camino College Compton Center will assist the district in improving its basic operations for an eventual return to local governance, and in taking the necessary steps to regain its accreditation.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The Compton Community College District covers an area about 29 square miles, encompassing the school districts of Compton Unified School District, Lynwood Unified School District, Paramount Unified School District and portions of the Long Beach Unified School District and Los Angeles Unified School District. In the 1960s, the composition of the student body changed from predominantly Caucasian to overwhelmingly African American. Demographic shifts are continuing to occur as the Hispanic population of the community increases.

According to data from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the current demographics of the student population are approximately 49% African American, 45% Hispanic, 2% Asian, 1% Caucasian and less than 1% each for Filipino, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and other categories. Both Hispanics and Caucasians are underrepresented when compared to the percentage of the adult population residing within the boundaries of the district. The 2000 Census shows that 58% of the adult population in the district is Hispanic and 23% of the population is white.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Compton Community College District has a five-member elected Board of Trustees, whose governing authority was suspended by the Chancellor under the authority granted by Assembly Bill 318. Board members are elected by trustee area, with two seats representing the city of Compton (Trustee Area 1) and one seat each representing Willowbrook - Enterprise and Carson (Trustee Area 2); Lynwood (Trustee Area 3); and Paramount (Trustee Area 4). Members serve four-year terms. The current four members of the board have served together since December 2005. Three of the current members are serving their first terms and one is in the second term.

Currently, the board seat for Trustee Area 2 is vacant. In January 2006, the Compton CCD declared a vacancy on its board after a board member resigned. This member had been reelected to another term on November 8, 2005, but did not execute the oath of office for the new term. The State Board of Education approved a petition to allow the election for that seat to occur in November 2007.

STATE INTERVENTION AND LOSS OF ACCREDITATION

In May 2004, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges issued Executive Order 2004-01, and installed Dr. Arthur Tyler, Jr. as Special Trustee to assist the Compton Community College District toward achieving fiscal stability and integrity. Subsequently, in August 2004, the State Chancellor issued another Executive Order (2004-02) authorizing the continuing authority of the Special Trustee to manage the college, and to suspend, for up to one year, the powers of the governing board of the college, or of any members of that board, and to exercise any powers or responsibilities or to take any official action with respect to the management of the college.

In January 2005, the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) placed the Compton Community College on "Show Cause". In July 2005, the Chancellor assigned Dr. Charles Ratliff to serve as Special Trustee as the college appealed its loss of accreditation to the ACCJC.

Thomas E. Henry was assigned to serve as the Special Trustee of the district in March 2006. On June 30, 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 318 (D-Dymally) into law giving the college district a \$30 million loan for recovery and the opportunity to partner with a college of good standing to offer accredited courses. The bill also gave the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) the responsibilities to conduct a comprehensive assessment and to develop a recovery plan for the college to regain local governance and accreditation.

AB 318 provided authorization for the chancellor to suspend the authority of the Board of Trustees for a period up to five years from the effective date of AB 318, plus a period lasting until the chancellor, the FCMAT, the Director of Finance, and the Secretary for Education concur with the special trustee that the district has, for two consecutive academic years, met the requirements of the comprehensive assessment conducted and the recovery plan prepared.

On August 22, 2006, the accreditation of the Compton Community College was formally terminated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

PARTNERSHIP WITH EL CAMINO COLLEGE

On January 22, 2007, the El Camino Community College District and the Compton Community College District entered into a formal relationship through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU provides a binding mutual understanding on the goals and objectives of the partnership. Under this MOU, the educational program offered on the Compton campus is provided under the auspices of El Camino College's accreditation. El Camino College is providing accredited instructional and related support services, in addition to administrative services to meet the needs of Compton students.

COMPTON CENTER LEADERSHIP

As part of the reorganization of the El Camino College Compton Center, the Office of the President/Superintendent was replaced by the Office of Provost/Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who reports to the President/Superintendent of El Camino College regarding Center operations and to the Special Trustee of the Compton Community College District for CCCD related matters. The Provost is a member of the ECCCD Cabinet, attends ECCCD Board meetings and meets regularly with the ECCCD Vice Presidents.

Two interim instructional deans were appointed in fall 2006 to supervise El Camino Compton Center (ECCC) instructional programs. ECCC faculty participates in the ECC Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, campus and department flex days.

ENROLLMENT

- Fall, Winter, Spring
 - ✓ Fall 2006 Unduplicated Headcount: 2851 Students in 425 Sections
 - ✓ Fall: 1107 FTES Winter: 126 FTES
 - ✓ Spring 2007 Estimated: 1107 FTES - Unduplicated Headcount: 3729
 - ✓ Projected 06-07 FTES Including Summer: 2688
 - ✓ Projected 07-08 FTES: 3,219
 - ✓ Projected 08-09 FTES: 3,862
 - ✓ Projected 09-10 FTES: 4,634

CURRICULUM AND CENTER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Twenty-Four (24) New Courses Adopted – Fall 2006
 - ✓ Nine Non-Credit ESL, Two English Basic Skills
 - ✓ Six Music Courses and a Music Certificate
 - ✓ Four General Education Courses (child development, ethnic Studies, sociology, psychology), Two Fire Tech , One Dance
- ECC HR Department Reviewed Personnel Files of All Faculty and Administrators to Ensure State Minimum Qualifications
- Probationary Faculty Scheduled to be Evaluated in Spring 2007; All Other Full Time and Part Time Faculty Next Academic Year

REDUCTION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF PARTICULAR KINDS OF SERVICE

- Notices to thirty-two (32) Regular or Contract Employees
- Notices of Non-Re-employment to six (6) Academic Administrators

EL CAMINO COLLEGE COMPTON CENTER HIGHLIGHTS

- First Semester U.C. Berkeley Student from Compton Center Reporting Success
- Fourteen (14) Compton Center Students Received Full Athletic Scholarships (Football)
- Twenty-Seven (26) Compton Center Students Passed State Nursing Examination
- Compton Center Men's Basketball Team South Coast Conference Champions – Advanced to State Championship Playoffs (Fresno)
- Collaborative Formed with U.C. Irvine and Cal State University, Long Beach

CLOSURE ON SIGNAGE ISSUE

- Identification of all Compton College Signage
- Removal and Replacement Process Initiated
- El Camino College - Compton Center

**FISCAL CRISIS AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE TEAM
(FCMAT)**

- Fraud Audit – Issued Week of March 12th
- Findings Submitted to Oversight Agencies
- Comprehensive Review – Issued mid-April
- Baseline to Measure Progress Over Time

STATE EMERGENCY LOAN (Amortization Period 20 Years)

- AB 318 Authorizes a \$30 Million Emergency Loan
- February 2007, \$7.8 Million Apportioned to the CCCD
- Expenditures Include Bond Proceed Adjustment, Structural Budget Deficit, Comprehensive Assessment, Recovery Effort, Safety and Health Issues
- Annual Re-Payment Budgeted in 2007-08 Budget