



A Compilation of Policy Analyses Related to Student Success in California Community Colleges

Education policy institutes and state agencies regularly study California community colleges and make recommendations for state and local policy and practice. The following chart is a compilation of recommendations from 24 key reports (listed at the end) related to fiscal and academic policy and practice, and state and local accountability for student success. The chart was prepared as a resource for the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS), a two-year initiative involving a cadre of community college CEOs and trustees studying the leadership strategies and policies needed to increase successful outcomes for community college students.

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>1. State Finance Policy: Funding Level</p>	<p>College revenues include state general funds, local property taxes, student fees and other sources, which comprise the state allocation to CCC's.</p> <p>A declining portion of the state's funds go toward higher education. (CTG/ECA)</p> <p>Post-Prop 13 environment creates unpredictable cycles of "boom and bust" funding. (ECO)</p>	<p>Increase Funding Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Link the increases in fees and state appropriations to the annual growth of state personal income per capita (MTS) ▪ Increase level of state funding for K-12 and higher education (CTG/ECA) ▪ Significantly increase the state's investment in educating community college students seeking a credential, basic skills, or workforce education (ICH)
<p>2. State Finance Policy: Funding Formula</p>	<p>The current funding formula was authorized by SB 361 in 2006, and was a result of a multi-year review by a statewide task force to update the 1990 funding formula. Funding is primarily driven by enrollment. (FTES)</p> <p>Many policy analysts note the lack of fiscal incentives for student achievement in the funding formula.</p>	<p>Revise the Funding Formula to Include Incentive or Performance Funding for Student Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address financing mechanisms that reward access but not success and are not responsive to regional variations (EAQ) ▪ Fund completions along with enrollments, with bonus funding for completions by disadvantaged and under-prepared students (ROG) ▪ Incorporate incentives for degree and program completion in funding formulas (GAI) ▪ Direct increased student fee revenues toward improving student persistence, completion and transfer (MTS) ▪ The CCCC should use distribution methods other than FTES that encourage student success (ICH) ▪ Reduce the portion of the base allocation to districts that comes from

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>3rd week enrollment and incorporate incentives for student progress and success (ICH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modify the community college funding model to provide for at least one of the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Payment for degree or course completions instead of enrollments ○ Payment for the achievement of intermediate goals such as completion of Adult Basic Education, developmental education, or the attainment of key credit completion thresholds as well as attaining a credential (CAC) <p>Revise Funding Formula to Include Incentives for High Need Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate incentives for offering high-need, high-cost programs into the base funding model (ICH)
<p>3. State Finance Policy: Targeted Funds and Categorical Programs</p>	<p>The state budget includes 22 line items for specific programs and needs. Many provide additional funds for programs designed to promote student achievement, including EOPS, Basic Skills Initiative, Matriculation, Puente, DSPS, and more. Many targeted program funds were cut significantly in the 2009-2010 state budget.</p> <p>The categorical funding mechanisms and related rules are complex and managerially expensive. (EAQ)</p>	<p>Provide Funding for Programs & Services that Foster Student Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redesign current targeted funding systems, building in appropriate incentives for student success (EAQ) ▪ Provide enriched funding levels for under-prepared and low income students with added incentives for graduating such students (ICH) ▪ Incorporate fiscal incentives for cooperation between K-12 and community colleges on college readiness (ICH) <p>Redesign Targeted and Categorical Programs and their Funding Formulas to Focus on Outcomes and Provide Flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change allocation formulas of categorical programs to encourage the outcomes that the categorical programs are intended to achieve ▪ Eliminate or re-design categorical programs that create silos between academic affairs and student affairs (ICH) ▪ For remaining categorical programs, minimize requirements for how funds must be used and focus accountability on ensuring that

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>program objectives are met (ICH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Give colleges flexibility to use funds to produce desired outcomes (ROG)
<p>4. State Finance Policy: Student Fees</p>	<p>Student fees set by state and included in state allocation. Student fees will increase to \$26 per unit in 2009-2010 (Note: the LAO recommended increases up to \$60 per unit).</p> <p>Student fees are low compared with other states.</p> <p>With some exceptions provided in law, colleges may not charge fees in addition to those set by the state.</p>	<p>Increase Student Fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase annual fees modestly from the current \$20 per credit, and match the increase with additional state appropriations (MTS) ▪ Increase student fees in order to partially or fully backfill the 2009 reductions in General Fund Support, given that the AOTC (American Opportunity Tax Credit) and financial aid will mitigate the impact on students (RF) <p>Allow Colleges to Retain Fee Revenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow colleges to benefit from fee revenue (ROG); allow districts to retain fee revenue on top of the state appropriation (ICH) <p>Allow Colleges to Charge Campus-Based Fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remove restrictions on campus-based fees, giving colleges more options (BOD, ROG) ▪ Allow colleges to charge campus-based fees to encourage effective enrollment patterns (e.g. fees for late registration, course add/drop/repeat) (ICH)
<p>5. Student Financial Aid & College Affordability</p>	<p>Higher education is becoming less affordable, even though California higher education fees are relatively low. (MTS)</p> <p>Financial aid levels and administrative support are not sufficient to meet demand.(TICAS)</p> <p>CCC students are less likely to apply for and receive federal grants and loans. (MTS, RF).Only 34% of California community college students apply for</p>	<p>Increase CCC Students' Use of Federal Financial Aid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhance financial aid and provide incentives to encourage students to work less and attend college on a more full-time and continuous basis (ROG) ▪ Increase financial aid options for CCC students and maximize their use of federal aid for which they are already eligible (GAI) ▪ Increase use of federal financial aid and tax credits (RF) ▪ Increase financial aid administrative funding levels, and provide incentives for colleges to increase spending on financial aid administration from their general funds (TICAS) ▪ Improve financial aid counseling to emphasize benefits of full-time enrollment (STS)

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	federal financial aid, compared to 45% of community college students nationally. (MTS)	<p>Increase State-Supported Financial Aid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Direct new appropriations (state’s match) to enhancements in financial aid outreach and capacity building and, to the extent these resources permit, to a new CCC grants program (MTS) ▪ Increase state’s investment in Cal Grant awards (MTS) ▪ Increase size of Cal Grant award (ICH) ▪ Increase and expand the Cal Grant B to provide a greater amount of state grant aid to a larger share of students (TICAS) <p>Develop Affordability Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop affordability policy based on total cost of college attendance (ROG) ▪ Adopt an affordability policy that ensures affordable access to a college education (GAI)
<p>6. State Finance Policy: Expenditures & Personnel Constraints</p>	<p>50% law protects hiring of instructional faculty and staff; inhibits hiring student services staff and providing non-instructional services.</p> <p>75/25 and the related full-time faculty obligation promotes hiring full-time faculty</p>	<p>Increase Flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Give colleges flexibility to use funds to produce desired outcomes (ROG) ▪ Give institutions more flexibility to use existing resources to best serve students (GAI) ▪ Give colleges flexibility to hire personnel in accordance with local and state needs for academic success & workforce. (ROG) ▪ Give colleges fiscal flexibility to provide students with the appropriate mix of classroom instruction and counseling services (BTB) ▪ In conjunction with an allocation formula that rewards student progress and success, minimize rules that prescribe how colleges are to spend their funds (ICH) <p>Modify the 50% Law</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modify the 50 percent law to incorporate all but administrative and facility expenditures to allow colleges to find the best mix of academic, academic support, and student support services to promote student success (ICH)

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend the 50% law to include counseling staff (ICH)
<p>7. Academic Policy: High School Relations</p>	<p>High schools and community colleges do not adequately collaborate (except work undertaken through CalPASS) on the skills needed for success in college. Not enough high school students are ready for college.</p> <p>High school curriculum and assessments are not necessarily aligned with college level work. HS and CC English skills assessments are similar, but math assessments are not. (MSC)</p> <p>Senate Bill 946 (Scott) became law in 2009. It enables CCC's to implement the Early Assessment Program, in which high school juniors take assessments to identify college readiness and address deficiencies, and responds to recommendations from the LAO and others.</p>	<p>Ensure High School Students Are Ready for College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Standardize the definition of college readiness and adopt an early assessment program in high school (ICH, STS) ▪ Increase the college-going rate of high-school graduates; decrease the drop-out rate by providing more information on skills needed, costs, and resources available (CTG/ECA) ▪ Accelerate college and career readiness planning across K-16 education that addresses readiness standards, curricular alignment, assessments of college readiness (GAI) ▪ Relay clear community college expectations in early in students education careers regarding course requirements for admission, which would require consistency across the community colleges (IA) ▪ Send clear messages to high school students, teachers, and counselors about college-readiness standards in the CCC (BOD) ▪ Implement a major communications campaign targeted to high schools to disseminate preparedness expectations of the CCC's (MSC) ▪ Better align curriculum and assessment with high schools to improve college readiness; use the Early Assessment Program (STS) <p>Assess Student Skills While in High School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess prospective CCC students while they are still in high school to signal their level of college readiness and give them an opportunity to address basic skills deficiencies before enrolling in a community college (BTB, STS) ▪ Develop standardized assessment practices and instruments that bridge K-12 and higher education to be used statewide (EAQ) ▪ The CCC System Office should allocate the resources to provide increased opportunities for assessment testing in high schools along with information to increase awareness of college expectations. (CCTF) ▪ K-12, CC's, and CDE must work together to specify what constitutes

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>readiness for college-level math, consulting with industry leaders on needed math competencies (MSC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote early testing/college placement tests for high school students (HCCOG) <p>Increase Number of High School Graduates Going to Community College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encourage direct college-going after high school (BOD) ▪ Disseminate strong messages about the benefits of attending directly from high school, full-time, and continuously (ICH) ▪ Promote dual enrollment (HCCOG)
<p>8. Academic Policy: Assessment and Placement</p>	<p>Assessment and placement practices are locally based; there is no statewide assessment or system.</p> <p>Although state regulations require assessment and other services to certain groups of students, many students avoid these processes.</p> <p>Validating and administering local assessments is costly and complex. Assessment and placement practices tend to be advisory to reduce barriers to enrollment and fear of legal challenge. The 1988 MALDEF legal challenges to assessments that may be culturally biased inhibited mandatory assessment and placement in the colleges.</p>	<p>Ensure Students are Assessed for College Readiness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise assessment and placement policies to ensure that prospective students receive clear and consistent messages about college readiness (BOD) ▪ Create a strong incentive for students to take required assessments (BTB) ▪ Ensure that all degree-seeking students are assessed for college readiness (ICH, STS) ▪ All entering community college students should be assessed to determine their readiness for college-level work (MSC) ▪ Promote regional collaboration (among CC's and between HS, CC's and universities) to identify and assess the knowledge and skills needed for college. ▪ Adequate resources must be provided to colleges to perform validation of assessment tests and prerequisites, including local research staff (ASCCC) ▪ Implement writing assessments (ASCCC) ▪ Develop/adopt placement exams and standards of achievement that establish clear benchmarks for what it means to be college ready in California (CAC) ▪ Mandate orientation, assessment and placement for all new students (BSF)

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>Standardize Assessment Instruments Across the State</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish clear, unequivocal consistent statewide college placement standards and cutoff scores systematically aligned with high school assessments and college placement tests (MSC) ▪ Standardize assessment instruments to use in conjunction with multiple measures (ICH) ▪ Make available a statewide CCC placement test derived from K-12's math and English standards tests. (BTB) ▪ Given the limited number of commercial tests used in the system, a comparability table should be developed for the test results from these tests (CCTF) ▪ Support the efforts of the California Community College Assessment Association to develop an ESL assessment test available for statewide use (CCTF)
<p>9. Academic Policy: Basic Skills</p>	<p>The CCC Chancellor's Office Strategic Plan included the Basic Skills Initiative to provide guidance and incentives to colleges to improve basic skills delivery and student success.</p> <p>A majority of students require basic skills instruction; more than a third of students enroll in basic skills. Asian, Pacific Islander and Latino students are overrepresented. (RP Group)</p>	<p>Provide Sufficient and Effective Basic Skills Curricula</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure developmental education is a clearly stated institutional priority (BSF) ▪ Centralize or highly coordinate the developmental education program (BSF) ▪ Provide comprehensive development opportunities for those who work with developmental students (BSF) ▪ Base instructional practice on validated research on effectiveness (BSF) ▪ Accelerate progress by integrating basic skills into career-technical programs (HCCOG) ▪ Provide acceleration strategies for students near the cut-off scores (HCCOG) ▪ Ensure that policies support innovative practices such as intensive summer orientation programs for new developmental students (STS) ▪ Contextualize basic skills instruction into content courses (STS) ▪ Implement learning communicates for development students (STS) ▪ Incorporate incentives for colleges to increase success in basic skills

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>courses (STS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redesign development courses into modules so students only repeat needed sections (STS) ▪ Provide brief brush-up courses for student who test near proficiency levels (STS) ▪ Enroll students in college-level courses and provide supplementary instruction/summer sessions for nearly-proficient students (STS) <p>Increase Early Placement of Students into Basic Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise assessment and placement process to ensure that students who need remedial work receive it early and enroll in classes in which they are prepared to succeed (GAI) ▪ Assess students' skills in math and English and place them into appropriate courses (BOD) ▪ Require underprepared students to begin addressing basic skills deficiencies immediately upon enrollment (BTB, STS) ▪ Encourage entering students to address their English and math needs right from the start (ASCCC) ▪ Facilitate student completion of necessary development coursework as early as possible (BSF) ▪ Ensure early advising that focuses on importance of taking math early in college career (STS)
<p>10. Academic Policy: Matriculation and Student Support</p>	<p>Orientation, counseling, advising, early alert and other services have been shown to support student success; however, delivery is not consistently available to all students who need assistance.</p>	<p>Provide Sufficient Support Services to Ensure Student Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide substantive orientation to college for all degree-seeking students (BOD) ▪ Provide high levels of student services, including tutoring, writing centers, academic advising (EAQ) ▪ Offer a comprehensive and integrated set of student support services; ensure students use them (BOD) ▪ Ensure that all degree-seeking students receive the full benefit of professional guidance to enroll in the courses that best promote success (BOD) ▪ Expand counseling, advising and other student support programs to

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>ensure that more students receive such services (BOD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institute early alert systems to identify students early who are in need of help (ICH) ▪ Ensure that students receive orientation and that it addresses need for basic skills (ASCCC) ▪ Provide adequate counseling services (ASCCC) ▪ Create a centralized “help desk” of student “case management” specialists to supplement student services at the campus level.(CAC) ▪ Provide a comprehensive system of student support services, characterized by a high degree of integration among academic and student support services (BSF) ▪ Provide clearer guidance and pathways for students (HCCOG) ▪ Require degree-seeking, non-traditional students to enroll in a success course (STS) <p>Ensure that Student Support Services Receive Sufficient Funding (also see #3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhance student support services through better funding and more supportive policies (GAI) ▪ The State should fully fund mandatory matriculation services; Matriculation funding should receive annual COLA and growth funding. (CCTF)
<p>11. Academic Policy: Enrollment and Student Goal Achievement</p>	<p>Only approximately one in four degree-seeking students are achieving a degree, certificate or transferring within six years of enrollment. (BOD)</p> <p>Research has identified a number of instructional activities that may promote or inhibit student success, including the institutional role in guiding student course-taking. (BOD, ROG)</p>	<p>Encourage Full-Time Enrollment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide incentives for full-time, continuous enrollment (e.g. priority registration) (ICH) ▪ Disseminate strong messages about the benefits of attending directly from high school, full-time, and continuously (ICH) ▪ Encourage enrollment patterns that correlate with higher completion, such as full-time, continuous enrollment and timely registration (GAI) ▪ Consider lower per-credit fees for enrolling in a full-time credit load (STS) ▪ Encourage full-time attendance through provision of financial aid and other incentives (STS)

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>Enrollment demand in all segments is expected to far outstrip capacity before 2012. (RP Group)</p>	<p>Revise Academic Policies that Hinder Student Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise academic policies to encourage student progress (ICH) ▪ Revise academic policies that inhibit collaboration between academic and student affairs (e.g. policies related to how faculty and staff are funded; related to academic calendar constraints) (ICH) ▪ Reduce restrictions on on-campus jobs to increase time on campus (ICH) ▪ Limit course drops and repeats or impose extra fee four course withdrawal past a certain date or for repeating a course (STS) ▪ Limit late registration or impose extra fee for registering late (STS) <p>Communicate Clear Expectations to Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Target students seeking credentials, and differentiate between degree-seekers and non-degree seekers (job skills, basic skills, or personal enrichment) (ROG) ▪ Set academic progress conditions for BOG fee waivers (ICH) ▪ Require degree-seeking students to enroll officially in an academic program by a certain time (ICH) ▪ Require degree-seeking students to declare a specific program focus and update it annually (BOD) ▪ Reduce restrictions on on-campus jobs to increase time on campus (ICH) <p>Revise Curriculum and Delivery to Promote Student Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community colleges should lead the way in developing richer, more revealing measures of student learning (SPECCC) ▪ Establish and communicate clear pathways for students to follow toward attainment of [goals] (GAI) ▪ Create more structure to degree pathways, including sequencing certificates (ICH) ▪ Structure programs to encourage completion of shorter-term credentials along the pathway to longer-term credentials (BOD) ▪ On-going, larger-scale improvement requires a lively, open “teaching

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>commons” that values the knowledge of practice (SPECCC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a pilot project which explores how the course outcomes of Freshman Composition, the course one level below Freshman Composition, and the course one level above Freshman Composition, align across community colleges. (Academic Senate, CCTF) ▪ Offer well-designed, scalable alternative delivery systems (EAQ) ▪ Develop a system-wide approach to delivering developmental education (CAC) ▪ Develop capacity for assessing—and giving credit for—prior learning (CAC) <p>Enhance Workforce Development Curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support career /technical education programs to help student develop skills that employers would accept in lieu of a bachelor’s degree (CTG/ECA) ▪ Adopt incentives to encourage degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields (GAI) ▪ Create more structure to degree pathways, including sequencing certificates (ICH) ▪ Encourage employers in promoting the importance of further education (CAC) ▪ Support the development and widespread acceptance of workplace readiness certifications (CAC)
<p>12. Academic Policy: Transfer</p>	<p>Transfer course requirements and articulation policies and practices are, to a large extent, institutionally rather than system based.</p>	<p>Improve Transfer Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enact legislation that directs the CCC to develop transfer associate degrees, working with UC and CSU, and designate that the completion of such a degree entitles students to admission to a public university (SCT) ▪ Enact legislation that directs CCC and CSU, and request that UC, work together to develop standardized GE and major preparation requirements. (SCT) ▪ Require development of a degree audit system (SCT) ▪ Develop transfer associate degrees and/or a common general

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		<p>education core to simplify the transfer path and process (ICH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build on and improve programs such as CAN, ASSIST, IMPAC, and IGETC (EAQ) ▪ Improve transfer rates with more effective remedial programs, early and accurate assessments, and coordination of course requirements between community colleges and four-year universities (CTG/ECA) <p>Advocate to UC and CSU for Policy Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encourage UC and CSU to offer baccalaureate coursework on community college campuses (BOD) ▪ Advocate that UC and CSU develop GE and pre-major requirements that would be consistent across all campuses (STR)
<p>13. Local District Research and Accountability</p>	<p>Research and planning functions and resources vary significantly among colleges.</p>	<p>Improve the Research Function across all Colleges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional research must be expanded to focus more directly on core issues of teaching and learning (SPECCC) ▪ Support college efforts to evaluate the impact of strategies that support student success, and expand such offerings where proven effective (BOD) ▪ Collect and maintain additional data in order to answer key questions and monitor progress in student success and completion (BOD) ▪ Provide professional development to support planning and evaluation functions on a regional basis (EAQ) ▪ Provide adequate resources to colleges to perform validation of assessment tests and prerequisites, including local research staff (ASCCC) ▪ Promote active participation of college practitioners as researchers into their own culture and practices (Dowd) ▪ Gather and use milestone data and indicators of success to monitor student progress and programs effectiveness (STS)
<p>14. State System Research and</p>	<p>Three major statewide data sets are collected and maintained by the System</p>	<p>Enhance Statewide Data Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide sufficient support for the CCCCO to develop/increase

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Accountability</p>	<p>Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARCC reporting system • MIS (Data Mart) • Student Right to Know <p>Community colleges are charged with accomplishing multiple missions (Education Code 66010.4).</p> <p>Community colleges are wary of using completion rates as the measure of effectiveness due to these “multiple missions.” (BOD, ROG)</p>	<p>analytical capacity (EAQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand system-wide MIS to colleges to provide 1) readiness data; 2) assessment data from assessments administered by the colleges; 3) data on enrollment in programs; 4) students use of matriculation services (ICH) ▪ Modify ARCC reporting system to report student progress and success rates for 1) students with fewer than 12 units, 2) by race and ethnicity (ICH) ▪ Establish a statewide system for the sharing of assessment testing data (CCTF) ▪ Identify gaps and inconsistencies in higher education data systems that prevent accurate analysis and planning and make changes to build comprehensive statewide analytic capacity (GAI) ▪ Identify additional data that need to be collected for basic skills programs to review student success in these programs (ASCCC) ▪ Develop a longitudinal student unit record system that allows students to be tracked from elementary-secondary education into and through postsecondary education and into the workplace (CAC) <p>Prioritize Missions; Identify Key Measures of Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While the community colleges have a number of missions, a key measure of success should be completion of a degree or certificate (BOD) ▪ Limit subsidy of personal enrichment in the CCC's to allow a stronger focus on core missions to increase educational attainment and workforce quality (GAI)
<p>15. State Leadership and Trends</p>	<p>Enrollment demand in all segments is expected to far outstrip capacity before 2012. (RP Group)</p> <p>The CA Master Plan for Higher Education provided for access for all to higher education; however budget reductions</p>	<p>Address Comprehensive Educational Policy Direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revisit the CA Master Plan (ECO) ▪ Address policy issues at the highest level of state government (EAQ) ▪ Create public awareness and broaden the base of support for community colleges from business, labor and other groups (EAW) ▪ Authorize an entity to direct state investment towards identifying state priorities and give it the resources to do so (RP Group)

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>and policy has not allowed for necessary enrollment growth. There are weak linkages and few incentives for collaboration across educational sectors. (EAQ)</p> <p>There is and will be a significant skills gap between California's workforce needs and the number of college graduates. (CTG/ECA)</p> <p>CCCCO is a state agency charged with leadership and oversight for and regulation of the colleges. Budget cuts over the years have reduced the numbers of staff.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cultivate and sustain an audience of state policymakers to consider and act upon a statewide policy and resource allocation agenda (RP Group) ▪ Capitalize on the proposed federal College Access and Completion Fund to leverage policy change (CAC) ▪ Designate a widely respected non-profit entity to receive the College Completion funds, lead the necessary planning activity and put in place the machinery for on-going implementation (CAC) ▪ Align state policy with policies shown to promote student success including use of performance measures and strong data systems. (HCCOG) <p>Foster Regional Collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide for an ongoing forum in which stakeholders come together to advocate for state educational needs, as opposed to single sector needs. (RP Group) ▪ Support regional planning initiatives within the state policy framework, to identify and address barriers to college (GAI) ▪ Produce cross-institutional initiatives (RP Group) ▪ Encourage urban area colleges to consider opening discussions on discouraging placement/assessment strategies as “college shopping” and “assessment shopping” (ASCCC) <p>CCC System Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a budget of the CCCCCO consistent with its mission (ICH) ▪ Institute regulatory reform and reduce procedural mandates that constrain flexibility; strengthen accountability expectations. (EAQ)
<p>16. Institutional Leadership and Culture</p>	<p>University-based leadership programs, The Community College League of California, ACCCA and other organizations play a continuing role in leadership development.</p>	<p>Make Student Success a Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that the success of underprepared students is an institution-wide, core responsibility (SPECCC) ▪ Align all institutional resources to support student success (HCCOG) <p>Provide Professional Development for Student Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development should be reinvented as an intellectually

POLICY AREA	CURRENT STATUS	RECOMMENDATIONS
		engaging, integral element of an educational institution (SPECCEC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support leadership development in community colleges (EAQ)

POLICY PAPERS, LISTED ALPHABETICALLY BY CODE FOR REPORT TITLE OR SPONSOR

BOD – *Beyond the Open Door: Increasing Student Success in the California Community Colleges*, by Colleen Moore, Nancy Shulock, Miguel Ceja, and David Lang; Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, August 2007.

BSF – *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges*. Research and Planning Group Center for Student Success, July 2007.

BTB – *Back to Basics: Improving College Readiness of Community College Students* by Paul Steenhausen, California State Legislative Analyst’s Office, June 2008.

CAC – *Utilizing College Access & Completion Innovation Funds to Improve Postsecondary Attainment in California* by Dennis Jones and Peter Ewell, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, June 2009.

CCTF – *Report of the Consultation Council Task Force on Assessment to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges*, January 2008.

CTG – *Closing the Gap: Meeting California’s Need for College Graduates*, by Hans Johnson & Ria Sengupta, Public Policy Institute of California, April 2009.

Dowd, Alicia. *Community Colleges as Gateways and Gatekeepers: Moving beyond the Access “Saga” toward Outcome Equity*. Harvard Educational Review. Pp 407-419, Winter 2007.

EAQ – *Ensuring Access with Quality to California’s Community Colleges*, Gerald Hayward, Dennis Jones, Aims McGuinness, and Allene Timar, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, May 2004.

ECA – *Educating California: Choices for the Future* by Hans Johnson, Public Policy Institute of California, June 2009.

ECO – *California Higher Education, The Master Plan, and the Erosion of College Opportunity*, by Patrick Callan, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, February 2009.

GAI – *The Grades are In – 2008: Is California Higher Education Measuring Up* by Colleen Moore and Nancy Shulock, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, February 2009.

HCCOG – *How Community Colleges Can Reach Obama’s Goals* by Davis Jenkins and Thomas Bailey, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, October 2009.

IA – *Investigating the Alignment of High School and Community College Assessments in California*, by Richard S. Brown and David N. Niemi, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, June 2007.

ICH – *It Could Happen*, by Nancy Shulock, Colleen Moore, J. Offenstien and M. Kirilin, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, February 2008.

MSC – *Policy Alert: Mixed Signals in California: A Mismatch between High Schools and Community Colleges*. National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, June 2007, March 2008.

MTS - *California Community Colleges: Making Them Stronger and More Affordable* by W. Zumeta and D. Frankle; The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, March 2007.

RF – *Raising Fees Could Mitigate Program Cuts and Leverage More Federal Aid*, by Paul Steenhausen, California State Legislative Analyst’s Office, June 2009.

ROG – *Rules of the Game* by Nancy Shulock and Colleen Moore, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, February 2007.

RP Group - *Environment Scan: A Summary of Key Issues facing California Community Colleges Pertinent to the Strategic Planning Process*. Research and Planning Group for the California Community Colleges, Center for Student Success, July 2005.

SCT – *Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California: Lessons from Other States*, Colleen Moore and Nancy Shulock, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, August 2009

SPECCC – *Strengthening Pre-collegiate Education in Community Colleges*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2008.

STR – *Promoting Access to Higher Education: A Review of the State’s Transfer Process* by Anthony Simbol, California Legislative Analyst’s Office, June 2006.

STS – *Steps to Success: Analyzing Milestone Achievement to Improve Community College Student Outcomes* by Colleen Moore, Nancy Shulock and Jeremy Offenstein, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, October 2009.

TICAS – *Green Lights and Red Tape: Improving Access to Financial Aid at California's Community Colleges*, The Institute for College Access & Success, 2007.

Additional Resources

Aligning American Higher Education with a Twenty-First Century Public Agenda: A Leadership Approach to Policy Reform, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the University of Virginia Miller Center of Public Affairs, June 9, 2008.

Introduction to Fiscal Responsibilities: A Resource for Community College Trustees, Community College League of California, 2008.

USC for Urban Education, *California Benchmarking Project* (Long Beach City College, LA Southwest College and Rio Hondo College).

POLICY PAPERS LISTED BY SPONSOR

Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges

- *Issues in Basic Skills Assessment and Placement in the California Community Colleges*, Fall 2004.
- *State of Basic Skills Instruction in California Community Colleges* Spring 2000.

California Community Colleges System Office

- CCTF- Report of the Consultation Council Task Force on Assessment to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges- January 2008.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

- SPECCC – *Strengthening Pre-collegiate Education in Community Colleges*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2008.

California State Legislative Analyst's Office

- BTB – *Back to Basics: Improving College Readiness of Community College Students* by Paul Steenhausen, Legislative Analyst's Office , June 2008.
- STR – *Promoting Access to Higher Education: A Review of the State's Transfer Process* by Anthony Simbol, Legislative Analyst's Office, June 2006.
- RF – *Raising Fees Could Mitigate Program Cuts and Leverage More Federal Aid*, by Paul Steenhausen, California State Legislative Analyst's Office, June 2009.

Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University

- HCCOG – *How Community Colleges Can Reach Obama’s Goals* by Davis Jenkins and Thomas Bailey, October 2009.

The Institute for College Access and Success

- *Green Lights and Red Tape: Improving Access to Financial Aid at California’s Community Colleges*, TICAS, 2007.

Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University, Sacramento

- ROG – *Rules of the Game* by Nancy Shulock and Colleen Moore, IHELP, CSUS, February 2007.
- BOD – *Beyond the Open Door: Increasing Student Success in the California Community Colleges* by Colleen Moore, Nancy Shulock, Miguel Ceja, and David Lang, August 2007.
- ICH – *It Could Happen*, by Nancy Shulock, Colleen Moore, J. Offenstien and M. Kirlin, IHELP, CSUS, February 2008.
- GAI – *The Grades are In – 2008: Is California Higher Education Measuring Up* by Colleen Moore and Nancy Shulock, IHELP, CSUS, February 2009.
- SCT – *Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California: Lessons from Other States*, Colleen Moore and Nancy Shulock, Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento, August 2009.
- STS – *Steps to Success: Analyzing Milestone Achievement to Improve Community College Student Outcomes* by Colleen Moore, Nancy Shulock and Jeremy Offenstien, CSUS, October 2009.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

- CAC – *Utilizing College Access & Completion Innovation Funds to Improve Postsecondary Attainment in California* by Dennis Jones and Peter Ewell, NCHEMS, June 2009.

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

- EAQ – *Ensuring Access with Quality to California’s Community Colleges*, Gerald Hayward, Dennis Jones, Aims McGuinness, and Allene Timar, NCPPHE, May 2004.
- MTS - *California Community Colleges: Making Them Stronger and More Affordable* by W. Zumeta and D. Frankle; NCPPHE, March 2007
- IA- *Investigating the Alignment of High School and Community College Assessments in California*, by Richard S. Brown and David N. Niemi, NCPPHE, June 2007.
- MSC – *Policy Alert: Mixed Signals in California: A Mismatch between High Schools and Community Colleges*. NCPPHE, March 2008.
- ECO – *California Higher Education, The Master Plan, and the Erosion of College Opportunity*, by Patrick Callan, NCPPHE, February 2009.

Public Policy Institute of California

- CTG – *Closing the Gap: Meeting California’s Need for College Graduates*, by Hans Johnson & Ria Sengupta, PPIC, April 2009.
- ECA – *Educating California: Choices for the Future* by Hans Johnson, PPIC, June 2009.

Research and Planning Group for the California Community Colleges

- *Environmental Scan: A summary of key issues facing California community colleges pertinent to the strategic planning process.* RP Group Center for Student Success, July 2005.
- *BSF - Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges.* RP Group Center for Student Success, July 2007.

Additional Resources

Aligning American Higher Education with a Twenty-First Century Public Agenda: A Leadership Approach to Policy Reform, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the University of Virginia Miller Center of Public Affairs, June 9, 2008.

Dowd, Alicia. *Community Colleges as Gateways and Gatekeepers: Moving beyond the Access “Saga” toward Outcome Equity.* Harvard Educational Review. Pp 407-419, Winter 2007.

Introduction to Fiscal Responsibilities: A Resource for Community College Trustees, Community College League of California, 2008.

USC for Urban Education, *California Benchmarking Project* (Long Beach City College, LA Southwest College and Rio Hondo College).

Acknowledgments

The development of this resource and the CLASS Initiative are supported by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the James Irvine Foundation. CLASS is managed by the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin.

This synthesis of policy recommendations related to student success in California community colleges was researched, compiled and edited by Cindra Smith, external evaluator for the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS) Initiative, with substantive contributions from Lisa Alcorta, CLASS Project Coordinator.