BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE
MEETING #5 AGENDA
CAMPUS DISTRICT VISIONING PROJECT

Meeting Objectives
1. Review BRC Meeting #4 outcomes and responses to information requests/questions
2. Review hybrid campus programming approaches, UC ANR Nano-Fiber program, and the potential Cyber Security cluster concept
3. Discuss and identify preferred direction and recommended priorities for the Campus District

When
February 21, 2019
6:00 PM – 9:00 PM

Where
Concord Senior Center
2727 Parkside Circle, Concord

BRC Members
Dominic Aliano, Concord
Councilmember Susan Bonilla, Council for Strong America
Edward Del Beccaro, East Bay Regional Manager, TRI Commercial
Greg Feere, Trades, Retired
Dr. Glenda Humiston, UC ANR
Randell Iwasaki, CCTA
Sharon Jenkins, John Muir Health
Buck Koonce, Lawrence Livermore NL
Bob Linscheid, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
Satinder Mahli, CSUEB
Dr. Nellie Meyer, Mt. Diablo USD
Carly Obringer, Concord Mayor
Victor Tiglao, Student Representative
Dr. Peter Wilson, Retired Dean, CSUEB
Dr. Fred Wood, CCCCD
Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council

Project Team
Valerie Barone, City of Concord
Kathleen Trepa, City of Concord
Guy Bjerke, City of Concord
Daniel Iacofano, MIG
Dan Amsden, MIG
Jamillah Jordan, MIG
Gabrielle Guidetti, MIG

I. Welcome and Agenda
   Review..........6:00 PM

II. Planning Process Overview and Draft Report Components......6:10 PM
   - Overall process schedule
   - BRC #4 detailed summary

III. Hybrid Campus Partnerships and Programming Approaches.......6:30 PM
   - iCAR (Greenville, SC)
   - Spokane District (Spokane, WA)
   - Aurora Campus (Denver, CO)

IV. UC ANR Nano-Fiber Technology Program Overview....................7:00 PM
    Dr. Glenda Humiston, UC ANR

V. Cyber Security Cluster..........................7:30 PM

VI. Identify Preferred Direction and Recommended Priorities for the Campus District.............8:00 PM
VII. Public Comments..........................8:45 PM

VIII. Close........................................9:00 PM
Summary of Discussion Topics

Introduction
The fourth Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) meeting of the Concord Campus District Visioning project was held on January 17, 2019, at the Concord Senior Center. The mission and charge of the BRC is to:

- **Review, evaluate and discuss** information and concepts for developing a higher education campus at the former Naval Weapons Station.
- **Assess** the feasibility of a range of campus development options, opportunities and strategies.
- **Develop** recommendations for the future campus district for consideration by the Concord City Council.

The objectives of this fourth meeting of the BRC was to respond to information requests and questions from BRC members, review campus and innovation district financing options, and discuss strategies for developing and strengthening partnerships. Presentations included an overview of the planning process and draft report components, and a detailed introduction to public-private hybrid model financing options presented by James Birkey of JLL. The presentation on financing strategies included three case studies, an overview of how to align public and private interests, and lessons learned from the past. The meeting also included time for questions and a discussion about potential financing strategies.

This was the fourth in a series of eight meetings that will be conducted between September 2018 and May 2019. All meetings are open to the public and facilitated by MIG, a planning and urban design firm which specializes in process design and stakeholder facilitation. The MIG facilitators graphically recorded comments of the BRC members and members of the public. A photo-reduction of the wallgraphic is included at the end of this document. This summary synthesizes the key discussion topics and questions raised during the meeting; it is not intended to serve as a transcription of the meeting.
The members of the Blue Ribbon Committee were appointed by the Concord City Council and includes the following individuals:

- Dominic Aliano, Concord Councilmember
- Susan Bonilla, Council for Strong America
- Edward Del Beccaro, East Bay Regional Manager, TRI Commercial
- Greg Feere, Trades, Retired
- Dr. Glenda Humiston, UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Randell Iwasaki, CCTA
- Sharon Jenkins, John Muir Health
- Buck Koonce, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
- Bob Linscheid, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
- Satinder Mahli, CSUEB
- Dr. Nellie Meyer, Mt. Diablo USD
- Carlyn Obringer, Concord Mayor
- Victor Tiglao, Student Representative
- Dr. Peter Wilson, Retired Dean, CSUEB
- Dr. Fred Wood, CCCCD
- Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council

Discussion Topics

BRC members first discussed and confirmed their vision and guiding principles for the campus. They then shared their thoughts and ideas on the best approach to finance the project and get it started. The input provided by the BRC members is summarized by theme below.

Vision and Guiding Principles

The project team presented a draft vision and guiding principles for BRC members to review and to provide feedback.

**Draft Vision:** To create a world-class, integrated campus providing a full range of academic programs from k-12 through graduate, with a focus on vocational and skills training that address the needs of the evolving economy. There will be strong partnerships with private companies to support research and development, technology, production, job creation and workforce development. The campus will blend seamlessly with Concord and create a place that engenders social and cultural activity. It will become a model for integrating higher education with industry in California and beyond.

Comments from BRC members:
- Replace “vocational and skills training” with “competency building.”
- Consider referring to the campus as a “master planned education district.”
- An integrated campus should refer to both regional integration within Concord and the northern California mega-region, but also the functional integration of uses within the campus district.
Reference to partnerships should also include partnerships with public institutions and NGOs/non-profits.

The vision should mention experiential learning with a focus on career education as a focus of the campus.

The team should talk to employers to better identify how the campus can serve them and successfully attract businesses to Concord.

Draft guiding principles:
1. Hybrid model
2. Equitable and inclusive
3. Integrated and sustainable campus
4. Attract/grow businesses and industries
5. Beautiful design
6. Functional design
7. Celebrate culture and arts
8. State-of-the-art
9. Jobs of the future
10. Strategic
11. Partnerships
12. Financeable and implementable

Comments from BRC members:
- Add a principle about recruitment of talent and people.
- Mention the importance of looking for opportunities beyond the 120 acres.
- Consider the new K-12 school proposed within the specific plan.
- Principle #5 “beautiful design” should focus on place-making and creating a gathering place for the community.
- Affordability to local students should be added as a principle.
- Fluidity should be added as a principle, highlighting the campus’ focus on competency-building, allowing students to come in and out based on their skills.

Getting Started
BRC members shared their thoughts and made recommendations on the ideal approach to getting the project started. The two primary considerations are the need for a strong institutional lead and the different options for supportive uses. Comments from BRC members include the following:
- The three pillars of a successful project are: a clear vision, a strong site, and healthy economics. So far, the BRC has created a strong vision for the project but need to focus on healthy economics.
- The need for a strong institutional lead was highlighted by many members who shared the following thoughts:
An institutional lead or anchor is needed to provide a strong revenue stream.

An anchor is needed but could take many forms, such as a private research institute or a partnership between multiple institutions.

A more agile non-profit should be attached to the educational institution.

Should consider real-estate value capture.

The integrated and hybrid approach has cons because it can disperse financing. The project needs a clear revenue stream that can be risk-assessed.

The institutional lead does not need to be a four-year stand-alone university.

- Ideas for different types of supportive uses were shared by BRC members:
  - Housing: affordable faculty and staff housing is key to drawing talent.
  - Retail
  - Conference center
  - Sports complex
  - Hotel

**Public Comment**

Several members of the public attended the BRC meeting. Below is a high-level of summary of their comments and questions for the BRC’s consideration.

- Focus on partners in the military industrial complex but this should be done appropriately, military already gets a vast budget.
- Focus on drone technology logistics, but this research should be separated from military reasons.
- Lobby for more public funding for education, rather than partnering with corporations.
- Public comments should come first.
- Need to create a dialogue with industries that want to locate in Contra Costa County.
- Residents will support the project with bond money if the vision and industry interest come together.
- The campus should be research-focused to foster growth. Need to consider what Concord can do to create a strong economic base?
- The campus needs more land and an anchor institution with a big name (e.g. Stanford).
- Public funding isn’t enough, private sector is the ideal partner.
Campus District Visioning Project
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Vision & Guiding Principles:

- Integrated...
- Attractive Business...
- Within the Regional
- Competencies...
- Partnerships...
- Private Public Non Profit
- Career Prep...
- New within K-12, the S.P.
- Experimental Learning...
- Mastery...
- #5 - A place of the County

How do we get started?

- In the case of NO public dollars...
- The sector could take many forms...
- Strong site chosen...
- Strong institutional lead

Do we need a strong institutional lead?

- A strong revenue stream needed...
- Private research institute could be the genesis...
- Let's not rule out some public funding...
- Include a more agile not-for-profit attached to the ED. Institution...
- Lease back...
- Real estate value capture...

Supportive Uses:

- Housing retail confer CTR sports complex etc.
To create a world-class, integrated master planned educational district providing a full range of academic programs from K-12 through graduate, including competency building that address the needs of the evolving economy. There will be strong partnerships with private companies, public institutions and NGOs/non-profits to support experiential learning, research and development, technology, production, job creation and workforce development. The campus will blend seamlessly with Concord and create a place that engenders social and cultural activity. It will become a model for integrating higher education with industry in California and beyond.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #1
HYBRID MODEL APPROACH

Create a **campus for all ages** and **skill sets**, including Kindergarten-12, vocational training, bachelorette and professional degrees, and graduate/post-graduate degrees and research.

Form an **innovation ecosystem** that holistically serves many industries (maker tech, robotics, drone delivery, health care, bio-mass, cyber security, etc.).

Blend **higher education with local industry**, including research and development, workforce training, technology and academic research.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #2
EQUITY AND INCLUSIVITY

Build on the diversity of Contra Costa County while improving social equity and removing barriers to higher education

Ensure the new campus is affordable to local students at all academic levels

Identify strategies for recruiting top talent to the campus through various incentives or other citywide programs (e.g., housing, local schools, etc.)
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #3
SUSTAINABLE CAMPUS

Consider the physical and natural environment of the Bay Area in the design of the new campus.

Capitalize on adjacent transit connections and the walking distances to future mixed-use and housing.

Incorporate sustainability into the design and operations of the campus.

Strengthen surrounding neighborhoods, both existing and new neighborhoods in the specific plan area.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #4

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ATTRACTION AND GROWTH

Use the design and programming of the campus to promote Concord and the broader region as an academic and industry epicenter.

Pursue international collaborations to expand the reach and reputation of the campus.

Include incubator space and access to research that will help grow local start-ups.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #5

BEAUTIFUL DESIGN

Build a **thematic identity** for the campus that attracts students, industries and partners.

Ensure the new campus fits the **scale** and **character** of the broader specific plan area.

Focus on **placemaking** so the campus can become a gathering space for the entire community to enjoy and celebrate.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #6

FUNCTIONAL DESIGN

Offer cutting edge facilities with modern equipment and amenities to make the campus an educational and research destination

Create a flexible physical campus that can adapt to new industries and the services of the future

Create smart buildings that have flexible interior layouts and high floor plates to allow a variety of future users

Identify opportunities to locate educational, research and other complimentary uses beyond the 120 acre campus
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #7

CULTURE AND ARTS

Incorporate cultural and arts programs and facilities that support the campus, Concord and the broader region.

Include liberal arts curriculum and programs to ensure a well-rounded education and opportunities for leadership training.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #8
STATE-OF-THE-ART

Consider creative **distance learning** approaches to expand the reach of the campus and offer a flexible learning experience to students of all backgrounds.

Attract **innovative manufacturing** and **maker-tech** businesses that benefit from campus research.

Include a “**competency building**” approach that allows students to efficiently complete academic programs based on their existing skills and experiences.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #9

JOBS OF THE FUTURE

Include a **broad array of specializations** to meet the diverse industry needs of today and tomorrow, while leveraging distance learning opportunities.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #10

STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION

Integrate infrastructure being developed as part of the broader specific plan with the campus to make a more cost-efficient project.

Develop a clear phasing approach, tied to the broader specific plan, that will allow the campus to incrementally grow.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #11

PARTNERSHIPS

Identify and nurture *partnerships* between different education providers (CSU East Bay, UC, community colleges, high schools, international connections, etc.) and top local industries.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE #12
FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Identify a range of funding sources and financing strategies to ensure flexibility as the vision and development of the campus mature over time.

Identify different ways to create public-private partnerships (P3, P4 and P5) that will allow many different users and industries to share costs burdens and revenues.
A student picks up groceries at Mount San Antonio College's mobile food pantry. Half of California community college students say they lack reliable access to
As student government president for the California Community Colleges, Iiyshaa Youngblood represents millions of people who scrape to pay for, and complete, even a two-year degree program. So you might expect the Inland Empire psychology major to be excited about a proposal to offer Californians two years of community college tuition-free.

You’d be wrong.

“That bill helps people who can already afford college,” Youngblood, a student at Moreno Valley College, says.
Community college students at risk

Half of California community college students have been food insecure. One in five has been homeless.

Source: Hope Center and California Community Colleges survey of students on 52 campuses, 2019

She’s referring to legislation introduced in December that would tack a second year onto California’s existing College Promise Program. The scholarship covers a year’s worth of fees—usually $46 per credit hour—for first-time, full-time students in community college districts that meet certain requirements, such as participating in the federal student loan program and offering counseling services.
The problem, according to Youngblood, is who isn’t eligible: part-time students, who make up more than two thirds of the community college population. While research shows students taking 12 units or more per semester are more likely to earn a degree or certificate, Youngblood says many low-income students are simply too busy working to handle a full-time course load.

And with rent, food, bus fare or car costs, and hundreds of dollars out of pocket every semester for textbooks, she said, students typically need those paychecks.

“I think a lot of times legislators are disconnected from what students actually endure.” she said. “It sounds good, but for a lot of people, especially students of color, it’s unrealistic.”

Youngblood’s skepticism illustrates the complexity of debates about tuition-free college programs, which are springing up around the country at a time of rising discontent with student debt and widespread evidence of food insecurity and homelessness on campus. Some state plans have garnered bipartisan support. But often, say college affordability advocates, “free” doesn’t really mean free.

California’s Promise program, for example, doesn’t address non-tuition costs, which make up the bulk of community college students’ total price of attendance. When those are taken into account, in most regions of the state, low-income students pay a higher net price for community college than they would to attend a California State University campus or University of California campus, according to a recent report from The Institute for College Access and Success.

That’s because there’s more grant aid available at the state’s four-year universities, the report says.
For community college students, “there isn’t nearly enough financial aid to bring their other costs of college in reach,” said TICAS vice president Debbie Cochrane in a statement accompanying the report.

In a recent Hope Center survey of 40,000 California community college students, half reported experiencing food insecurity in the past year; one in five said they’d been homeless.

“When we came up with this we thought, ‘How do we make this a conversation so that college is within somebody’s reach, so they can feel it and taste it, whether they’re a parent or a student?’”

Assemblymember Miguel Santiago

Assemblymember Miguel Santiago, the bill’s author, says he sees the College Promise program as just one piece of a larger college affordability agenda. The program’s requirement that students apply for other federal or state aid, the Los Angeles Democrat said, is designed to lead them to grants that might help cover their living costs.
Over a third of high school graduates nationwide didn’t complete a federal student aid application in 2018, according to a NerdWallet analysis, leaving $2.6 billion in need-based Pell Grants on the table. Students can be confused by the form, think they’re not eligible for help, or have concerns about family members’ immigration status.

Santiago also said he wants to amend his bill so that current part-time students could receive Promise fee waivers if they decide to take 12 units per semester. But he was firm that students should attend full-time. That way, he said, “it’s not just a giveaway. There’s responsibility on both sides.”

California’s economy will need about a million more college graduates by 2030 than the state is on track to produce, the Public Policy Institute of California estimates. Conscious of that projected gap, policymakers are looking for ways to encourage students to earn degrees quickly.

Lawmakers’ focus on tuition was on display in Gov. Gavin Newsom’s proposed 2019-2020 budget. Community colleges have spent the past year building food pantries and making it easier for students to spend food stamps on campus, thanks to $10 million in grants from a state fund aimed at fighting college hunger.

But that money expires this year, and Newsom didn’t include plans to renew it—though the governor did set aside $40 million to provide a second year tuition-free, along with more support for students with children.

A coalition of anti-hunger activists and student government groups has drafted a letter to legislative leaders asking them for $20 million to combat hunger on community college campuses next year, along with $5 million each for UC and CSU.
“The forward momentum in preventing hunger on college campuses has been tremendous,” reads the draft letter, which the coalition shared with CALmatters. “Without this funding, campus leaders expect to lose momentum and even lose ground.”

At Mount San Antonio College in the Southern California suburbs, administrators crunched some numbers and found that the typical student who would receive a fee waiver was a white, male teenager from the upper-middle-class town of Diamond Bar.

Because California already waived community college tuition for low-income students prior to the Promise program—the income ceiling is about $37,000 for a family of four—it mostly helps students whose families earn too much to qualify for a waiver.
That poses a dilemma for people like Chris Nellum, director of higher education research at The Education Trust-West, which works to close the achievement gap for low-income students and students of color.

“It is really challenging to say you don’t support a free college program,” he said. “It’s something I struggle with personally.”

“Is this going to help students? Sure, it’ll help some students. But for the students we care about at Ed Trust West, the ones I’ve spent my career trying to support, I’m not sure it’s going to help them.”

Some community colleges have chosen to use their Promise dollars for non-tuition benefits designed to help the neediest students, rather than slash fees for everyone.

At Mount San Antonio College in the Southern California suburbs, administrators crunched some numbers and found that the typical student who would receive a fee waiver was a white, male teenager from the upper-middle-class town of Diamond Bar.

“The zip codes where they were from and the age group doesn’t match what our neediest students are,” said Bill Scroggins, the college’s president.

Instead, said Scroggins, the college is using the money to offer first-time students free bus passes, book grants of up to $250 per semester, and food cards that can be used to buy meals on campus. To qualify, students must be enrolled full-time and earn at least a 2.0 GPA.

Las Positas College, in the San Francisco Bay Area, has also used part of its Promise funds to help students with textbooks—up to $500 per semester. The college will spend the rest on hiring more financial aid
counselors to help students apply for other forms of aid, said vice president of student services William Garcia.

While about half of the college’s students already paid no fees, said Garcia, very few of them had any assistance with textbooks and supplies, which can cost full-time students nearly $2,000 a year.

“If you start the first day of class and don’t have that book the teacher’s requiring, you’re going to get behind from day one,” he said.

“It is really challenging to say you don’t support a free community college program. It’s something I struggle with personally.”

Chris Nellum, The Education Trust-West

Supporters of a universal tuition waiver say its importance is symbolic. It sends high-school students a simple message: College is accessible to you.

The Los Angeles Community College District has seen a 24 percent bump in Los Angeles Unified School District graduates enrolling right after high school since it began offering them a year of free tuition in 2017. Students who participated in the district’s Promise program were also more likely to continue for a second year than their peers in previous classes.
“When we came up with this, we thought, ‘How do we make this a conversation so that college is within somebody’s reach, so they can feel it and taste it, whether they’re a parent or a student?’” said Santiago, who also sponsored the original College Promise legislation in 2017.

Universal programs can also be politically popular, as middle-class families, too, are squeezed by college costs. In a PACE/USC Rossier poll released this week, California voters ranked college affordability as the second-most important education issue for the state, behind gun violence in schools.

Some states have gone farther than California, extending tuition-free community college to part-time and returning students. As California lawmakers debate adding a second free year of tuition, they will also consider whether to overhaul the state’s other financial aid program, the Cal Grant, to cover more of students’ living costs.

With a Democratic super-majority in the legislature, the question is likely not to be whether to continue California’s march toward free college, but how far to go.

“The idea is not going anywhere,” Nellum said.

*This story and other higher education coverage are being supported by College Futures Foundation.*
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Report: San Antonio could be 'global industry leader' in cybersecurity, IT

By Jason Plautz
Published Feb. 1, 2019

Dive Brief:

- The cybersecurity and information technology (IT) industry holds the "greatest opportunity for San Antonio to become a global industry leader," but too many jobs remain unfilled, according to a new report from SA Works, an arm of the San Antonio Economic Development Foundation.

- SA Works found that jobs in those fields, such as software developer and information security analyst, will see double-digit growth in demand over the next five years, often outpacing the national average. However, despite demand, those positions are not currently being filled. Last year, only 24% of technology jobs were filled in the city, according to a separate SA Works report.

- San Antonio is exploring construction of a security operations center that would monitor municipal computer networks, reports the San Antonio Business Journal.

Dive Insight:

Recent investments by global companies like PricewaterhouseCoopers, Booz Allen Hamilton and Lockheed Martin to build tech outlets in San Antonio have helped bolster the city's industry and reputation as a tech destination. Based on a survey of more than 30 companies, the development agency found that the most in-demand occupations were applications
software developer (75% of companies reported demand), systems software developer (56%) and information security analyst (53%). The findings were presented at a conference in San Antonio on Thursday.

SA Works says that continuing that momentum will mean not just bringing in talent from abroad, but growing it at home. Thirteen universities and colleges offer cyber degree programs, with five of them getting a designation as a "Center for Academic Excellence in Cyber Defense/Information Assurance Education" from the federal government. That includes the University of Texas at San Antonio, which recently announced plans for a new School of Data Science to be located on a new urban campus, backed by $70 million from the University of Texas System Board of Regents.

In an opinion piece for the San Antonio Express-News, Accenture Federal Services managing director Ali Bokhari also touted the use of apprenticeship programs to retrain employees and "enable people to become contributing members of the digital workforce."

The fact that the San Antonio government is exploring its own cybersecurity hub — which the Business Journal reports would monitor the region's energy utility, water system and transit network — shows the growing interest in fostering the industry (it also comes after the city announced plans to create "innovation zones" to test new technology). Cities around the country are vying to attract tech jobs, and cybersecurity has offered a good entry point; cities like New York City and Los Angeles have tried to invest directly in the field to grow a new workforce.

Texas has especially been a tech jobs hub, and a focus on cybersecurity would help San Antonio keep up with its neighbors. Austin, for example, has captured a new Apple campus that could accommodate up to 15,000 employees, as well as a U.S. Army technology development center.
Recommended Reading:

- Information Technology & Cybersecurity: 2019 Demand Occupation and Education Report

San Antonio Express News
Report: San Antonio’s cyber, IT firms hurting for trained workers

San Antonio Business Journal
City of SA looks to stand up shared cybersecurity center
Dive Brief:

- The City of Atlanta will launch a Center for Workforce Innovation job training program focusing on high-demand careers. The program will be hosted at Atlanta Technical College as part of a partnership between the college, the city and the Atlanta Committee for Progress.

- An initial $2 million investment from partnering corporations will support three career tracks: aircraft technical skills, information technology (IT), and skilled trades like carpentry and electrical construction. The funding will also support a tuition balance forgiveness program and transportation vouchers for students, while WorkSource Atlanta, the city’s workforce development agency, will offer tuition assistance of up to $10,000 to students who qualify.

- The Center will launch a pilot program with 200 students in the fall of 2019.

Dive Insight:

The program draws on support from Atlanta businesses like Delta Air Lines, The Home Depot, SunTrust, Intercontinental Exchange and Georgia Power. The investment not only allows
the companies to give back to Atlanta, but help support training of potential future employees in their own fields.

“Our business and civic leaders have a longstanding history of working together to strengthen communities. As we now partner Atlanta’s leading corporations with one of the nation’s best technical college systems, Atlanta residents gain a newfound opportunity to acquire the skills needed to earn higher wages and better provide for themselves and their families,” Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms said in a statement.

Amid a changing labor market, retraining programs can help out-of-work or at-need residents find a new job, or bring more diversity to some markets. Atlanta’s focus on information technology as one of its three initial training tracks comes as cities are desperate to attract new tech talent, leading to some cities to invest in their own training programs. New York City, for example, has invested in cybersecurity education and training, as well as a separate program that helps mothers learn how to code.

**Recommended Reading:**

City of Atlanta
Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms Announces Center for Workforce Innovation in Partnership with Atlanta Committee for Progress and Atlanta Technical College ⏳
SAN FRANCISCO (AP) — Federal forestry officials say the die-off of trees in California forests slowed in 2018 thanks in part to the state receiving more rain.
But the U.S. Forest Service warned Monday that dead trees continue to pose a hazard to people and infrastructure, especially in the central and southern Sierra Nevada regions where they can serve as fuel for wildfires.

A survey found 18 million trees died in 2018, compared to 27 million the previous year. More than 147 million trees have died in California since 2010, the start of a five-year drought.

 Officials declared an end to the drought in 2017 after a wet winter that drenched the state in rain and snow. But California has seen some of its worst wildfires in recorded history since then.
Downtown Williams, California, a town north of Sacramento. Photo by Max Whittaker for CALmatters.
My turn: Here’s one way Newsom can be rural California’s governor
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GUEST COMMENTARY: Find out more about submitting a commentary.

By Joe Rodota, Special to CALmatters

The Camp Fire was the most destructive and deadliest fire in state history, and the world’s costliest natural disaster of 2018. The fire destroyed more than 18,000 homes and businesses and caused $16.5 billion in damages in Butte County. In Shasta County farther north, the Carr Fire destroyed over 1,000 homes in nearby and caused an additional $1.5 billion in damage.

The devastation only adds to the ongoing struggles of Californians living in a region of the state seemingly a world away from the booming coastal economies.

Per capita income in the Redding, Chico and Yuba City area was just a third of the Bay Area region in 2016. The Public Policy Institute of California reports that the entire northern third of the state has seen no change in its poverty rate since 2011.

Such stagnation makes college attainment more challenging for the region’s high school graduates. The Oakland-based Children Now found that Lassen County had the smallest rate of college- or career-ready students in the state, followed by four other Northern California counties – Glenn, Trinity, Tehama and Del Norte.

In response to the devastating wildfires, Gov. Gavin Newsom proposed tens of millions to help local governments recover tax revenues, and $19 million in direct aid to school districts affected by the disasters.
If Newsom really wants to change the direction of the state’s long-neglected northern region, he’ll need to do more.

He included $2 million in his 2019-20 budget to review options for a new California State University campus in San Joaquin County, likely in Stockton, 135 miles from Paradise, the epicenter of the Camp Fire.

The governor’s proposal should be expanded to include study of another potential campus: a Cal Poly for Northern California.

Just three of the 23 California State University campuses, Sonoma, Humboldt and Chico, are located in the northern third of the state, and there’s no University of California campus north of Davis. The only public post-secondary institution in over 10,000 square miles of the northern third of the state is Shasta Community College.

The California State University system includes two polytechnic campuses: Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, which opened in 1901, and Cal Poly Pomona, which came into its own in 1966. They enroll a total of 47,000 students who follow a “learn by doing” curriculum focused on physical sciences, business and economics, with 28 percent of students enrolled in engineering programs and another 13 percent enrolled in science and math.

Notably, less than 1 percent of the 2018 student body at the two polytechnic colleges come from the northernmost 18 counties.

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo’s four-year graduation rate is better than any other CSU campus and is consistently ranked as one of the best public schools in the state. And a Cal Poly degree is a relative bargain: Tuition and student fees at Cal Poly are $9,400 per year, compared to more than $14,000 at UC Berkeley.

A new Cal Poly campus in Northern California would:

- Boost the regional economy. Cal Poly-San Luis Obispo generates over $1 billion a year in economic activity for the surrounding region. In recent years, the school has helped transform an otherwise sleepy pocket of the central coast into a booming outpost for Silicon Valley, drawing more than 7,800 tech workers to the region. A Cal Poly-North could attract jobs, money, and a
cutting-edge tech sector to a region where students would pay far lower housing prices than in Los Angeles or the Bay Area.

- Address student demand. Cal Poly campuses are wildly popular among college-bound California high school seniors The two campuses receive over 100,000 freshman and undergraduate transfer applications per year, but reject nearly 60 percent of these potential students. Cal Poly-San Luis Obispo alone rejected more than 10,000 first-time freshmen with a grade point average of 4.0 or higher.

At the turn of the previous century, journalist Myron Angel proposed a “polytechnical school” to offer technical training in math and sciences to California’s students. A college dropout who came to California during the Gold Rush with no money, Angel envisioned a university that would “teach the hand as well as the head, so that no young man or young woman will be sent off in the world to earn their living as poorly equipped for the task as I when I landed in San Francisco in 1849.”

In his inaugural address, Gov. Newsom promised to be a governor for rural California.

“Many in our rural communities believe that Sacramento doesn’t care about them – doesn’t even really see them” he said. “Well, I see you.”

It’s time to look at Northern California’s educational needs with fresh eyes.

Joseph Rodota, a Sacramento consultant, was cabinet secretary and deputy chief of staff to Gov. Pete Wilson, joe@fwdobserver.com. He wrote this commentary for CALmatters.

---
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CALmatters welcomes commentary pieces focused on California policy and politics. Below are our guidelines:

- We will edit them, post them on our site and share them with our news partners. They may publish them.

- Your op-eds must be exclusive to CALmatters and no more than 650 words.

- Please include your photo and email address for publication.
Please also include phone number so we can reach you.

If your piece is selected for publication, we will ask that you sign a release, and statement that you have read and accept our ethics policy.

Please contact Dan Morain with any questions, dmorain@calmatters.org, (916) 201.6281.

Want to submit a reader reaction? You can find our submission guidelines here. Please contact Dan Morain with any questions, reactions@calmatters.org, (916) 201.6281.
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Introduction

California has a vast and complex education system. It is filled with an array of educational entities—from preschool centers to high schools and law schools. The missions of these entities range from helping kindergarteners learn to read to providing adults instruction in English as a second language to supporting students as they train for their career aspirations. Funding for education is intricate too, with some costs covered by local, state, and federal governments and other costs supported by students and their families. Given California’s education system has so many facets, even those who have been immersed in it for years can at times feel daunted trying to understand it and keep apprised of all that is changing within it. For state policy makers who need to be familiar with this system and who make important decisions that shape and reshape it, this report is designed for you. It is intended to help you learn as much as possible about the system as quickly as possible.

The report covers every major area of California’s education system, with chapters on early education, K-12 education, adult precollegiate education, undergraduate education, graduate education, and education facilities. Throughout the report, we rely almost entirely upon state and federal government data sources and cite the most readily available data. Within each chapter, we tend to focus on the students who are served, the state programs designed to serve them, the funds supporting those programs, how program funding is spent, and what is known about outcomes in that area. As you journey through the report, you will be exposed to information on everything from student diversity and achievement gaps, to student aid and borrowing, to faculty salaries and rising pension costs, to the requirements for becoming a teacher or doctor in California. We hope the report is a helpful reference guide for you.
State Provides Subsidized Care to a Small Portion of Eligible Children
2016 Unless Otherwise Specified

Half of Subsidized Children Receive Care in a Center
Excludes Transitional Kindergarten and Part-Day State Preschool, 2016-17 for Most Programs

Nearly Half of Children Receiving Subsidized Care Are School Age
Excludes Transitional Kindergarten and Part-Day State Preschool, 2016-17 for Most Programs
California Subsidizes Many Child Care/Early Education Programs

Number of Slots by Program, 478,000 Total Slots, 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Alternative Payment</th>
<th>Part-Day State Preschool 103,000</th>
<th>Full-Day State Preschool 67,000</th>
<th>Transitional Kindergarten 90,000</th>
<th>CalWORKs Stage 1 39,000</th>
<th>CalWORKs Stage 2 59,000</th>
<th>CalWORKs Stage 3 44,000</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Families Move Through Three Stages of CalWORKs Child Care

- **Stage 1**: Child care is available when a family enters CalWORKs.
- **Stage 2**: A Stage 1 family transfers to Stage 2 when the county deems it stable.
- **Stage 3**: A Stage 2 family transfers to Stage 3 two years after it stops receiving cash aid.

Each Program Has Specific Eligibility Requirements

For most subsidized child care programs, parents must be low income and working or in school. Currently, a family is eligible to enter the subsidized child care system if its income is at or below 70 percent of the state median income (SMI). In 2018-19, this equated to $54,027 for a family of three. Starting July 1, 2019, the entering income cap is set to increase to 85 percent of the SMI—equating to a roughly $10,000 increase in the cap.

**Program**

- **CalWORKs Child Care**
  - Family is low income.
  - Parent(s) work or are in school.
  - Child is under age 13.
  - Slots are available for all eligible children.

- **Alternative Payment and General Child Care**
  - Family is low income.
  - Parent(s) work or are in school.
  - Child is under age 13.
  - Slots are limited based on annual budget appropriation.

- **State Preschool**
  - Family is low income.
  - Child is age 3 or 4.
  - If parent(s) work or are in school, child is eligible for full-day program.
  - Slots are limited based on annual budget appropriation.

- **Transitional Kindergarten**
  - Child is age 4 with a birthday between September 2 and December 2.
  - Slots are available for all eligible children.
  - Program has no income or work requirement.
Standards Vary by Program

Current Standards for Licensed Centers, Infant Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>CalWORKs Child Care and Alternative Payment</th>
<th>General Child Care and State Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Certain health and safety standards, such as cleaning equipment must be stored in a location inaccessible to children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Qualifications</td>
<td>Child Development Associate Credential or 12 units in early childhood education/child development.</td>
<td>Child Development Teacher Permit (24 units in early childhood education/child development plus 16 general education units).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Activities</td>
<td>None (but some providers offer such activities).</td>
<td>Certain developmentally appropriate activities, such as using toys that develop fine motor skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Unannounced visits by Community Care Licensing (a division of the Department of Social Services) every three years or more frequently under special circumstances.</td>
<td>Same, but also onsite reviews by California Department of Education every three years (or as resources allow) and annual self-assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standards are somewhat different for different settings and age groups. For example, staff at a family child care home need 15 hours of health and safety training instead of a credential or permit. All child care staff, including license-exempt providers, must pass a criminal background check. License-exempt providers do not need to meet any of the requirements listed above. These providers are limited to serving children from only one family at a time.

Every Year, State Funds Efforts to Improve Program Quality

Federal law requires states to spend a certain amount each year on improving the quality of child care and preschool programs. In 2018-19, California spent $190 million on its improvement efforts. As the pie chart shows, about 40 percent of expenditures were for supporting QRIS, which rates participating child care and preschool programs and helps them achieve and maintain high ratings.
State Funds Programs in Different Ways

- **CalWORKs Child Care and Alternative Payment**
  - **Vouchers**
    - State gives a family a voucher.
    - Families may send their children to voucher-based centers or family child care homes or have family or friends provide care.
    - State relies on regional agencies to verify attendance and pay providers.

- **General Child Care and State Preschool**
  - **Direct Contract**
    - State contracts with a provider to serve a set number of children.
    - Families may send their children to direct-contract based centers or family child care homes.
    - State reimburses provider for filled slots.

- **Transitional Kindergarten**
  - Families may send their children to a nearby public school.
  - School district reports attendance.
  - State funds the school district for each enrolled child.

Per-Child Subsidies Vary by Program, Setting, and Age

Annual Full-Time Rates Unless Otherwise Noted, 2018-19

- **Regional Market Rate Averages**
  - Applies to Voucher-Funded Providers
  - Based on Biennial Market Survey

- **Standard Reimbursement Rate**
  - Applies to Contract-Funded Providers
  - Set Annually by State

- **Local Control Funding Formula**
  - Applies to School Districts
  - Set Annually by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Family Child Care Home</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant/Toddler</th>
<th>Toddler</th>
<th>School Age</th>
<th>School Age/Preschool</th>
<th>School-Year Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-time rates reflect a minimum 6.5 hour day for 250 days per year.
Mix of Funds Support Child Care/Early Education Programs in California
2018-19

The share of state funding has increased over the past 10 years—growing from 65 percent in 2008-09 to 74 percent today. The increase is attributable to the state creating the Transitional Kindergarten program and expanding its State Preschool program.

Funding for Child Care/Early Education Is at All-Time High
Total State and Federal Funding, 2018-19 Dollars (In Billions)
California’s K-12 Student Population Differs From Nation
Fall 2015 Data, Unless Otherwise Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Federal Poverty Line (2017)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Low Income</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Speaking Households (2017)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Disabilities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Education (2017)</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Only</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disabilities Affect About One in Ten K-12 Students

Share of Enrollment by Disability Type and Grade, 2017-18

Students With Disabilities Receive Individualized Education Programs
Illustrative Goals and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speech Impairment</td>
<td>Clearly Articulate Words</td>
<td>Weekly Speech Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>Read at Grade Level</td>
<td>Weekly Work With Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>Develop Job Skills</td>
<td>Subsidized Part-Time Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growing Share of Students Has Relatively Severe Disabilities
Share of Overall K-12 Student Enrollment
Although Many Districts Are Small, Most K-12 Students Attend Large Districts

California has 944 school districts, averaging 5,600 students each. The largest district is Los Angeles Unified with more than 400,000 students.

K-12 Enrollment Trends Vary Greatly Across State

Enrollment Change, 2008-09 to 2017-18

Los Angeles County had the largest decline. 137,000 students, 8 percent
Charter Schools Follow Statutory Process for Opening and Operating

1. A group develops an educational plan for a charter school
2. Group collects signatures from interested teachers or parents
3. Group submits plan to local district for approval
4. Charter school opens and charter staff manage day-to-day operations
5. District provides oversight and decides whether to renew charter every five years

Charter School Enrollment Has Been on Steady Climb Upward
Charter Schools as Share of Overall Enrollment

On Average, Charter Schools Serve Students Similar to Other Public Schools
Share of Overall Enrollment, 2017-18

- **Low Income**: 59% (Charter) vs. 80% (Traditional)
- **English Learners**: 16% (Charter) vs. 24% (Traditional)
- **Students With Disabilities**: 10% (Charter) vs. 12% (Traditional)
- **Hispanic**: 49% (Charter) vs. 55% (Traditional)
- **White**: 28% (Charter) vs. 23% (Traditional)
- **Black**: 8% (Charter) vs. 5% (Traditional)
California Schools Rely Heavily on State Funding
Total Operational and Capital Funding by Source, 2015-16

Unlike most other states, the California Constitution limits local property tax rates.

School Funding Is at an All-Time High
State and Local Operational Funding Per K-12 Student, 2017-18 Dollars

California School Spending Ranks in the Middle of States
Rank Among the 50 States and Washington D.C.

School spending in California is more sensitive to recessions and recoveries than other states.
State Provides Schools Equal Base Funding Per Student
Base Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Rates by Grade Span, 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>Base Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten - 3rd Grade</td>
<td>$8,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th - 6th Grade</td>
<td>$7,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th - 8th Grade</td>
<td>$7,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th -12th Grade</td>
<td>$9,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Provides Additional Funding for English Learners and Low-Income (EL/LI) Students
LCFF Rates Per Student for Grades K-3 Based on District EL/LI Share, 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL/LI Share</th>
<th>Base Funding</th>
<th>Additional Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% EL/LI Share</td>
<td>$8,235 Total Funding</td>
<td>$0 Additional Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% EL/LI Share</td>
<td>$8,647</td>
<td>$412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% EL/LI Share</td>
<td>$9,059</td>
<td>$824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% EL/LI Share</td>
<td>$10,294</td>
<td>$2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% EL/LI Share</td>
<td>$11,735</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Basic Aid” Districts Receive More Funding Per Student

Most districts receive a combination of state and local funding at a level determined by the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).

Basic aid districts receive local property tax revenues above the LCFF funding level. Under the California Constitution, they still receive $120 per student in basic aid state funding.

### Basic Aid Districts Concentrated in Certain Areas of the State

Share of Students Attending Basic Aid Districts, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Aid Districts by the Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11%</strong> of all districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4%</strong> of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30%</strong> more revenue ($3,600) per student than other districts on average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong> of students in basic aid districts attend Bay Area schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50%</strong> are very small (serve fewer than 500 students each).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staff Compensation Is Largest School Expenditure**

$85 Billion Total Expenditures, 2016-17

**Teachers Comprise About Half of School Staff**

600,000 Total Employees, 2016-17

**Statewide Staffing Ratios**

1 Teacher : 21 Students
1 Administrator : 231 Students
1 Other School Employee : 22 Students

**Teacher Compensation Is on the Rise**

Salary and Health Benefits, 2016-17 Dollars

- In inflation-adjusted terms, average statewide teacher compensation was $8,900 (11 percent) higher in 2016-17 than 2000-01.
- Increases in health benefit expenditures accounted for about two-thirds of compensation growth over the period, whereas salary increases accounted for about one-third. (These figures exclude pension-related increases.)

**District Pension Costs Are Growing Notably**

School District Contributions (In Billions)

- The California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) administers pensions for teachers, administrators, and other employees with a state credential. The California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) covers all other types of school employees.
- CalSTRS is in the midst of implementing a state plan that raises district contribution rates through 2020-21. The plan is designed to address CalSTRS unfunded liabilities over the next few decades. The governing board of CalPERS also is increasing district rates.
- Total district pension costs are expected to reach $9.5 billion by 2020-21, an increase of $6.3 billion over the 2013-14 level.
Student-to-Teacher Ratio Has Been Declining
Number of Students Per Teacher

California’s Ratio Is Consistently Higher Than National Average
Number of Students Per Teacher

Certain Regions, Districts, and Subject Areas Tend to Have More Difficulty Recruiting Teachers

- Permits and waivers allow districts to hire or assign teachers who are not fully credentialed in an applicable subject area. They provide one indicator of unmet demand for credentialed teachers.
- Permits and waivers are typically valid only for one year. In 2016-17, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issued around 8,000 permits and waivers.
- As the charts below show, certain parts of the state, high-poverty districts, and the special education subject area tend to have higher rates of teachers working on permits or waivers.

Waivers and Permits by County
Average Per 100 Teachers, 2016-17

Waivers and Permits by District Poverty Level
Average Per 100 Teachers, 2016-17

Waivers and Permits by Subject Area
Average Per 100 Teachers, 2016-17

Data is not available for Alpine County.
Most California Teachers Prepared Via a Five-Year Pathway

2016-17

Bachelor’s Degree
4 Years
Complete subject matter training and earn bachelor’s degree

Teacher Training Program
1 Year
Complete pedagogical training and student teaching
200 programs
19,000 enrolled students

Teacher Induction Program
2 Years
Individualized support for new teachers provided by mentor teachers
170 programs
14,000 enrolled teachers

Earn Clear Credential
Fee must be paid every 5 years to renew

Earn Preliminary Teaching Credentials
Valid for 5 years

District/University Internship Program
1 or 2 Years
Complete pedagogical training while serving as teacher of record
180 programs
4,700 enrolled students

Bachelor’s Degree From Accelerated Blended Program
4 Years
Earn bachelor’s degree and complete pedagogical training simultaneously
25 programs
240 enrolled students

Demonstrate Foundational Knowledge and Skills and Subject Matter Expertise

Pass Student Teaching Assessment

Fewer Than Half of K-12 Students Meet State Standards
Percentage Meeting Standards, Spring 2018

California Students Score Below National Average
Average Score on National Assessment of 4th Grade Reading

In 2017, states’ average 4th grade reading score ranged from a high of 236 to a low of 207. Scores follow a similar pattern for other grade levels and subjects.

Achievement Gaps Exist
Average Percentile Rank on State Tests, Spring 2017

- **Hispanic**: 36th, 39th, 54th
- **White**: 45th, 60th, 70th
- **Black**: 27th, 32nd, 46th
- **Asian**: 62nd, 77th, 84th
### State Measures District Performance in Four Key Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>State Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Test Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Chronic Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Transitions</td>
<td>Suspension Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measured for 13 Student Groups

- English Learners
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
- Foster Youth
- Homeless Youth
- Students With Disabilities
- American Indian
- Asian
- African American
- Filipino
- Hispanic
- Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- White

In fall 2018, the state identified 374 districts as having poor performance for at least one student group in two or more areas. (This count includes 31 county offices of education.)

### Almost Half of Identified Districts Have Poor Performance With Only One Student Group

#### Share of Identified Districts

- Three or More Student Groups
- Weak Performance With One Student Group
- Two Student Groups

### Students With Disabilities Most Common Group With Poor District Performance

#### Share of Identified Districts by Student Group With Performance Problem

- Students With Disabilities: 65%
- Homeless Students: 39%
- Foster Youth: 28%
- African-American: 18%
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 18%

Districts identified with a performance problem may find a team of experts to help them improve, work with their county office of education to find such a team, or seek support directly from their county office of education.
State Has Process for Overseeing School Districts’ Budgets

Ongoing Monitoring
County offices of education (COEs) review the fiscal health of all their school districts at least two times per year. Based upon these reviews, each district receives one of the following ratings:

- **Positive:** The district will meet its obligations for the current and upcoming two years.
- **Qualified:** The district may be unable to meet its obligations for the current or upcoming two years.
- **Negative:** The district will be unable to meet its obligations for the current or upcoming year without corrective action.

Technical Assistance and Intervention
If a district receives a qualified or negative rating, its COE undertakes at least one first-level intervention. Second-level interventions follow if the district’s budget does not improve.

- **Typical First-Level Interventions:**
  - Require district to provide additional information or updated projections.
  - Assign the district a fiscal expert.
  - Require district to develop its own plan for improving its fiscal health.

- **Typical Second-Level Interventions:**
  - Directly assist the district in developing a plan for improving its fiscal health.
  - Impose revisions to district’s budget.
  - Veto actions of district’s governing board.

Emergency Loan Process
If a district’s budget deteriorates to the point that it will run out of cash:

- **Legislature Authorizes Emergency Loan.** The Legislature authorizes a direct appropriation to the district from the state General Fund.

- **District Loses Local Control.** The district’s superintendent is fired and its local governing board loses all authority. An external administrator assumes control of the district and implements a fiscal recovery plan.

- **A Trustee Remains Until Loan Is Repaid.** The district’s governing board gradually regains authority from the administrator as it improves its management and fiscal condition. After the administrator departs, a trustee is appointed with the ongoing power to veto local board actions.
School Districts in Fiscal Distress at Historically Low Levels
Share of School Districts by Fiscal Status

During the 12 years prior to 1991, 26 districts requested emergency loans spurring the state to create the current fiscal oversight process.

Since 1991, Only Nine School Districts Have Requested Emergency Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Year of Legislation</th>
<th>Current Oversight</th>
<th>Loan Amount</th>
<th>Loan Pay Off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Unified</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>$29 million</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Monterey County Joint Union High</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>$13 million</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo City Unified</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fresno Elementary</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery Unified</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Unified</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Unified</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>$7.3 million</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Contra Costa Unified</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>$29 million</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top four districts have active loans. Their loan pay-off dates reflect the life of their loans. Most districts with retired loans paid off their loans early.
California Uses Regional Consortia to Plan Adult Education Offerings

In 2013-14, the state restructured its adult education program to improve regional coordination. Under the restructuring, 71 adult education consortia were created. A typical consortium includes 1 community college district and about 5 adult schools (operated by school districts). Each consortium develops a regional adult education plan every three years and updates it annually.

Adult Schools Have Notably Higher Adult Education Enrollment
Share of Headcount by Provider Type, 2016-17

ESL Is Largest Adult Education Instructional Area
Headcount by Instructional Area, 2016-17
Adult Education Serves Broad Spectrum of Students

Students by Age Group, 2016-17

Students by Ethnicity, 2016-17

Compared to State Population, Adult Education Students Are Less Likely to...

Have High School Diploma, 2016-17

Be Employed, 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Students</th>
<th>State Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 13-19</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20-29</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-39</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40-54</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55+</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several Major Funding Sources Support Adult Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Eligible Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Education Program</strong></td>
<td>Adult Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated by formula to regional consortia to support full array of adult education programs.</td>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncredit Apportionments</strong></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated by formula to community college districts to support full array of adult education programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), Title II</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated competitively to adult education providers based on various factors, including student learning gains. Supports English as a Second Language, adult secondary education, and adult basic education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Is Primary Source of Adult Education Funding

Major Funding Sources, 2017-18 (In Millions)

Some Providers Receive Funding From Additional Sources:

Some funding from the federal Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education (CTE) Act supports CTE courses for adult students.

Some CCC credit apportionment funding supports courses similar in content to adult education courses.

Adult schools may charge course fees for CTE courses.

Since the state restructured its adult education program in 2013-14, it has had no comprehensive data on program outcomes. The limited data that is available is insufficient to draw meaningful conclusions. State agencies report that data improvement efforts are underway.
Each Segment Has Mix of Small and Large Campuses
Percentage of Campuses by Undergraduate Headcount, 2016-17

UC undergraduates take an average of 29 units per year, compared to 24 units at CSU and 13 units at CCC. (A student taking 30 units per year could graduate in four years at UC and CSU and two years at CCC.)
Share of Young Adults in California Attending College Has Been Increasing
Percent of Individuals Age 18-24 Enrolled in Degree-Granting Postsecondary Schools

In 2016, the share of young adults enrolled in postsecondary schools was slightly smaller nationally (43 percent) than in California (48 percent).

Educational Attainment Also Has Been Increasing in California
Educational Attainment of Individuals Age 25 Years or Older

In 2016, a slightly larger share of adults had a high school diploma or less nationally (40 percent) than in California (38 percent), and a slightly smaller share had a bachelor’s or degree or higher nationally (31 percent) than in California (33 percent).
Almost One-Third of Undergraduates Are Age 25 and Older
Undergraduate Headcount, Fall 2015

The Racial/Ethnic Composition of the Undergraduate Student Body Varies by Segment
Undergraduate Headcount, Four Largest Groups, 2016-17

California Population
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COC issues a liberal arts certificate upon completion of a certain set of transferable lower-division coursework. Many students receiving this certificate may also be receiving an associate degree.

**Health and Liberal Arts Are Most Common Fields for Certificates**

Certificates by Field, 2016-17

**Humanities Is Most Common Field for Associate Degrees**

Associate Degrees by Field, 2016-17

**Business and Social Sciences Are Most Common Fields for Bachelor’s Degree**

Bachelor’s Degree by Field, 2016-17
California’s Freshman Eligibility Policy for High School Graduates Has Three Tiers

100% Eligible for CCC

12.5% Eligible for UC

33% Eligible for CSU

For UC and CSU Admissions:

- High school students must complete college preparatory coursework (known as "A through G") with a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 and 2.0, respectively.
- UC also requires all applicants to take the SAT or ACT.
- CSU requires only those applicants with a GPA below 3.0 to take the SAT or ACT.
- The lower the GPA, the higher the test score needed.

Freshman Acceptance Rates
Vary Notably Across Campuses
California Applicants, Fall 2017

Freshman Enrollment Rates Also
Vary Notably Across Campuses
California Admits, Fall 2017

Some applicants to UC and CSU do not meet minimum eligibility requirements. In addition, certain campuses and academic programs have higher admission requirements (due to high demand) that applicants do not meet.
Community College Students Must Meet Several Requirements to Be Eligible for Transfer to UC or CSU

Transfer Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>UC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete 60 semester units of transferable coursework</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the 60 units, complete specified number of core courses</td>
<td>10 Courses</td>
<td>7 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve minimum GPA in transferable coursework</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer Acceptance Rates Vary Across Campuses
California Applicants, Fall 2017

If an eligible transfer applicant is denied admission to a first-choice campus, CSU automatically redirects to another nearby campus with space. UC redirects to Merced or Riverside.

Transfer Enrollment Rates Also Vary Across Campuses
California Admits, Fall 2017
Number of High School Graduates Expected to Peak Soon and Then Begin Dropping
Public High School Graduates, Projections From the Department of Finance, 2018 Series

Participation Fluctuating at CCC, Growing at CSU, Steady at UC
Percent of California High School Graduates Enrolling at Each Segment

CCC Enrollment Below Peak Levels
Resident Full-Time Equivalent Students

University Enrollment at Peak Levels
Resident Full-Time Equivalent Students
Amount of Core Funding Varies Notably by Segment
Per Full-Time Equivalent Student, 2018-19 Dollars

State Is Largest Source of Higher Education Funding
Breakdown of Core Funding Per Full-Time Equivalent Student, 2018-19 Dollars

At UC and CSU, core funds consist primarily of state General Fund and student tuition revenue. At CCC, core funds also include local property tax revenue.

At UC, “other” includes a portion of overhead on federal research grants and patent royalty income.
Students without financial need pay the rates shown. Across the three segments, about half of undergraduates receive gift aid that covers the full tuition charge.

Tuition Still Is Relatively Low at CCC and CSU, Higher at UC

Resident Tuition Charge, 2017-18
California Students Receive Over $8 Billion in Aid Annually
Need-Based Gift Aid for Undergraduates, 2016-17

Among CSU campuses, the average cost of attendance (tuition and living costs) for students living off campus was about $23,800 in 2015-16.

Families with lower incomes pay lower net prices. The trend is similar at the other public segments.

Federal Aid
$4.1 Billion

State and Institutional Aid
$4.1 Billion

Cal Grants: Provide gift aid for students enrolled at public and private schools.

California College Promise Grants: Cover tuition for CCC students.

UC Grants: Cover tuition and some living costs for UC students.

State University Grants: Cover tuition for CSU students.

Other State and Institutional Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-48,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48,001-75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend is similar at the other public segments.

Net College Costs Are Lowest for Lowest-Income Students
Cost of Attendance Less Gift Aid, Average Across CSU Campuses, 2015-16
For Most Students, Living Costs Are More Than Half of Overall Costs

Cost of Attendance by Living Arrangement, Average Across Campuses, 2017-18

A Majority of Students Live Off Campus

Undergraduates by Living Arrangement, 2017-18

Living Costs Do Not Vary Notably Across the Segments

Estimates for Students Living Off Campus as Reported by the Segments, 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Diego City College</th>
<th>San Diego State University</th>
<th>University of California, San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room and Board</td>
<td>$13,293</td>
<td>$12,761</td>
<td>$12,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
<td>$1,854</td>
<td>$1,854</td>
<td>$1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$1,233</td>
<td>$1,919</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$3,006</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$19,386</td>
<td>$17,984</td>
<td>$18,371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCC does not collect comparable data for their students. Most CCC students live off campus or with family. Few CCC campuses have on-campus housing.
About Three-Quarters of Community College Funding Is Unrestricted

Proposition 98 Funding, 2018-19, $9.2 Billion

Unrestricted
The split between unrestricted and restricted funding has remained about the same over the last ten years.

Unrestricted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Development Programs</th>
<th>Student Support Programs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State Recently Changed How Unrestricted Funding Is Allocated

Enrollment
Virtually all unrestricted funding was allocated based upon enrollment.

Enrollment
About 60 percent of funding will be based upon enrollment at full implementation (expected 2020-21).

About 20 percent is based on the number of students who receive a federal Pell Grant or need-based fee waiver.

About 20 percent will be based on performance at full implementation.

Subset of Outcome Measures
2020-21, Awards by Student Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Pell Grant Recipient</th>
<th>Need-Based Fee Waiver Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-level math and English completed within first academic year</td>
<td>$1,760</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>$444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more career technical education units completed</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Has No Consistent Approach to Budgeting for the Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgetary Action</th>
<th>Example of Years Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided state-funded base increase on the condition that segments did not raise student tuition.</td>
<td>2013-14 through 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided state-funded base increase while also allowing segments to raise student tuition.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not provide state-funded base increase but allowed segments to raise student tuition.</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not provide enrollment growth funds or set an enrollment growth target.</td>
<td>2008-09, 2009-10, 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set an enrollment target and provided enrollment growth funds.</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set an enrollment growth target but required segment to use base increase to cover associated cost.</td>
<td>2016-17 (CSU only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set an enrollment target but required existing funds be redirected to cover associated cost.</td>
<td>2018-19 (UC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided funding for specific programs or initiatives.</td>
<td>2015-16, 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced or eliminated funding for specific programs or initiatives.</td>
<td>2009-10 (UC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed segments to repurpose former categorical funding as they wished.</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universities Decide How to Allocate State Funds

Office of the President: Central-office operations

Systemwide Programs
- **UCPath** (payroll system) | **System Initiatives** (mostly specified research and outreach programs) | **Debt Service on Capital Outlay Bonds**

Campus Allocations
- Most Campuses receive a uniform per-student amount.
- Campus allocations, however, are weighted to reflect the higher instructional costs for graduate and health science students.
- **San Francisco and Merced** receive more per student, reflecting the former’s emphasis on health science instruction and the latter’s relatively small size.

Chancellor’s Office: Central-office operations

Systemwide Programs
- **System Initiatives** (mostly specified instructional and student support programs) | **Debt Service on Capital Outlay Bonds**

Campus Allocations
- **Campuses** typically receive additional funding for negotiated compensation increases and planned enrollment growth. Recently, the state also has provided campuses with funding for the Graduation Initiative.
Nonresident Enrollment Has Been Increasing at All Segments

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Undergraduate Students

Nonresident Students Comprise Increasingly Large Share of UC Enrollment

Nonresident Share of Undergraduate FTE Enrollment

Including Supplemental Charges, Nonresidents Pay Higher Tuition Compared to Other States

Nonresident Tuition Charges, 2017-18

Legislature Expects UC to Limit Nonresident Enrollment

Nonresident Share of Undergraduate FTE Enrollment at Each UC Campus, 2017-18
Compensation Makes Up Large Share of Core Spending at CSU
Core Spending, 2016-17

Compared With CSU, UC Spends More on Student Aid
Core Spending, 2016-17

CSU Faculty Salaries Are Higher Than Peer Institutions
Average Annual Salary, 2016-17

UC Faculty Salaries Are Higher Than Peer Institutions Too
Average Annual Salary, 2016-17

Pension Costs Continue to Increase
(In Millions)

Pension costs are among the most quickly growing costs the universities and other public agencies face.
CSU Has Seen Greater Improvement in Graduation Rates Than UC and CCC

Six-Year Rates

![Graph showing graduation rates comparison between UC, CSU, and CCC over six years.]

Achievement Gaps Exist

CCC Six-Year Graduation Rates, 2011 Freshman Cohort

![Bar chart showing graduation rates by race/ethnicity and aid status.]

Though UC and CSU graduation rates are higher than CCC, achievement gaps generally follow a similar pattern at all three segments.

Graduates Accrue More Units Than Degrees Typically Require

Freshman Entrants, 2016-17 Graduating Class

![Bar chart showing required units and excess units for CCC, CSU, and UC.]

Though UC and CSU graduation rates are higher than CCC, achievement gaps generally follow a similar pattern at all three segments.
CHAPTER 5

GRADUATE EDUCATION
Nonprofit Sector Consistently Enrolls the Most Graduate Students

Fall Headcount by Sector

The decline for CSU is primarily due to decreasing enrollment in its teacher credentialing programs.

About Four Master's Degrees Are Earned for Every One Doctorate Earned

Degrees Produced in California by Sector, 2016-17

Master’s
77,000 Degrees

Professional Doctorates
11,000 Degrees

Research Doctorates
8,000 Degrees
Graduate Students Tend to Be Younger at UC Than Other Sectors
Headcount by Sector and Age, Fall 2017

California Has a Diverse Graduate Student Body
Headcount by Sector and Race/Ethnicity of U.S. Citizens, Fall 2017
More Than Half of UC Graduate Students Come From Out of State
First-Year Graduate Students, Fall 2017

Larger Share of CSU Graduate Students Come From California
Graduate Students, Fall 2017

Data for first-year graduate students at CSU was not readily available. At both UC and CSU, most out-of-state graduate students who are U.S. citizens gain California residency after their first year of study.

China Is Largest Country of Origin for International Graduate Students at UC
Top Five Countries of Origin, Fall 2017

India Is Largest Country of Origin for International Graduate Students at CSU
Top Five Countries of Origin, Fall 2017
Master’s Degrees Are Concentrated in a Few Key Fields of Study
2016-17

Number of Master’s Degrees Continues to Grow
Master’s Degrees Produced Each Year in California

Degrees in California over period shown grew at an average annual rate of 3.4 percent.

California consistently produces around 10 percent of the nation’s master’s degrees each year.
Some Master’s Programs Have Higher Tuition Charges
Annual Systemwide Tuition and Fees for Selected Programs, 2018-19

At CSU, business master’s students are charged a higher amount.

UC charges supplemental tuition for many master’s programs. Some charges vary among campus.

Debt Rising for Some Master’s Students
Average Debt of UC Borrowers at Graduation, 2016-17 Dollars

In 2016-17, around 30 percent of business students and 60 percent of education students graduated with debt.
Over the Years, About Half of Research Doctorates Have Been in Science, Math, and Engineering

Degrees Produced in California by Field of Study

Completion Varies Notably by Field of Study

Ten-Year Graduation Rates for UC Doctoral Students, 2005-07 Cohorts

UC Doctoral Students Tend to Take At Least Five Years to Graduate

Average Years Enrolled to Degree, 2005-07 Cohorts
Most Research Doctoral Students Receive Substantial Financial Support

Average Annual Aid Provided Per Student, 2015-16

Average Net Stipend Provided Per Student, 2015-16

Research Doctoral Students in Certain Fields Have Higher Debt Levels

Average Debt of UC Borrowers at Graduation, 2016-17 Dollars

*Net stipend* reflects the amount of financial support a student has remaining after covering tuition and fees.
California Has 62 Law Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nationally Accredited</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 schools</td>
<td>16 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,995 students</td>
<td>8,607 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756 first-time bar takers</td>
<td>2,448 first-time bar takers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hastings</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Accredited</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 school</td>
<td>20 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932 students</td>
<td>400 first-time bar takers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 first-time bar takers</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationally Accredited</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unaccredited</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 schools</td>
<td>19 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,607 students</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,448 first-time bar takers</td>
<td>151 first-time bar takers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California’s five public schools are nationally accredited. Number of students at state accredited and unaccredited schools is not readily available.

Law School Enrollment Is Declining Nationally... ...And in California

Juris Doctor Students at Nationally Accredited Schools Throughout the Country

Juris Doctor Students at Nationally Accredited Schools in California

Since 2011-12, enrollment nationally and in California has declined 24 percent. Institution-level data for public and private schools is not readily available prior to 2011-12.
California Law Schools Charge Higher Tuition Than National Average

Annual Resident Tuition and Fees at Nationally Accredited Schools, 2017-18 Dollars

Among public schools, California has some of the highest tuition charges in the country. Among private schools, California ranges from among the highest tuition charges in the nation (over $60,000 at the University of Southern California and Stanford University) to among the lowest ($30,000 at the University of La Verne).

75 percent of students at public law schools and 46 percent of students at private law schools in California receive a tuition discount. Very few law students have their tuition fully waived.

Average Debt of Law Students Has Not Increased Notably in Recent Years

Average Debt of Borrowers at Graduation, 2017 Dollars

Most Law Students Graduate With Debt

Share of Graduates With Debt

Private Schools

Public Schools
Among Law Schools in California, Public Ones Tend to Have Better Exam Outcomes

California Bar Examination First-Time Pass Rates, 2017

- Berkeley
- Los Angeles
- Irvine
- Davis
- Hastings

Public Law Schools Also Tend to Have Better Employment Outcomes

Employment Field/Status Upon Graduating From Nationally Accredited Law Schools, 2014-2017

- Legal Field
- Legal-Related Field
- Other Field
- Further Education
- Under/Unemployed

California

Rest of U.S.
Physicians Have a Long Education and Training Pathway

Typical Pathway to Become a Physician in California

Undergraduate College
Typically four years with courses in biology, physics, chemistry, and other subjects

Obtain Bachelor’s Degree

Medical School
Two years of courses in science and clinical care

Obtain License

Post Graduate Training
Depending on specialty, additional years of residency and fellowships

Obtain Certification

Stage 1 of Licensing Exam

Stage 2 of Licensing Exam

Stage 3 of Licensing Exam

Certification Exams

Physicians Focus in One of the Following Areas

Specialty Areas as Defined by Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education

Primary Care
Family Medicine
Internal Medicine
Pediatrics
Obstetrics/Gynecology

Medicine-Based Specialties
Allergy and Immunology
Dermatology
Neurology
Osteopathic Medicine
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Psychiatry

Surgical-Based Specialties
General Surgery
Colon and Rectal Surgery
Neurological Surgery
Ophthalmology
Orthopedic Surgery
Otolaryngology
Plastic Surgery
Thoracic Surgery
Urology

Hospital-Based Specialties
Anesthesiology
Emergency Medicine
Medical Genetics and Genomics
Nuclear Medicine
Pathology
Preventative Medicine
Radiation Oncology
Radiology
A Few Medical Schools Are Experiencing Relatively High Rates of Enrollment Growth

Number of Medical Students by School

Postgraduate Slots Have Grown Steadily

Number of Active Residents and Fellows in California

Fellows typically have completed their residency and are pursuing further specialization.
Tuition Charges Steadily Rising for Medical Students
Annual Resident Tuition and Fees of Doctor of Medicine Programs, 2017-18 Dollars

Debt Also Rising for Medical Students
Average Debt of Borrowers Upon Graduating From UC Medical Schools, 2016-17 Dollars

About 70 percent of graduates from UC medical schools graduate with debt.
K-12 School Facility Program (SFP) Is Based on Shared Responsibility

Under SFP, the state and school districts share project costs. The district share is 50 percent of costs for new construction and 40 percent for modernization. Projects receive funding on a first come, first serve basis.

- **New construction** grants are awarded to districts that lack sufficient space for their current or anticipated student population.
- **Modernization** grants are for renovating facilities 25 years or older.

CCC Facilities Also Typically Rely on Both State and Local Funding

The CCC Chancellor’s Office submits a list of proposed community college projects to the Legislature and Governor each budget cycle it prioritizes its requests in the following order:

- Projects to address life safety, seismic deficiencies, or building failure risks.
- Projects to increase instructional capacity, modernize instructional space, complete campus build-outs, and house support services.

Projects with a local match receive greater consideration.

Voters Have Approved Substantial State Funding for K-14 Facilities

State General Obligation Bonds (In Billions)

Since 2002, voters have approved $41 billion in state K-14 bonds. As of December 2018, $1 billion in state bond funding remains available. Annual debt service on these bonds is approximately $2.5 billion per year.

Voters Also Have Approved Substantial Local Funding for K-14 Facilities

Local General Obligation Bonds (In Billions)

Since November 2002, voters have authorized $134 billion in local K-14 bonds. As of early 2018, $53 billion in local bond authority remained available.
Higher Education Segments Have Notable Footprints
Number of Campuses, Acres of Land, and Building Square Footage at Each Segment, 2018-19

UC’s research mission, agricultural programs, and five medical centers contribute to the segment’s large footprint relative to its number of campuses.

The state funds core academic facilities—classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and faculty offices. Housing, bookstores, medical centers, athletic facilities, and other nonacademic facilities are supported by fees and other nonstate funds. About half of UC facilities and three-quarters of CSU facilities are academic. CCC does not have an estimate, but its share of academic facilities is likely higher than at CSU.

Many Buildings Constructed Several Decades Ago
Number of Buildings by Date Constructed, 2018-19

The average building is 43 years old at UC, 41 years old at CSU, and 30 years old at CCC. The age of a facility is not necessarily an indication of its condition. How well the facility is maintained and when it was last renovated are better indicators of its current condition and remaining useful life.
State Has Had a Hands-On Approach to Funding Higher Education Capital Outlay

State Spending on Higher Education Capital Outlay, 2012-13 Dollars (In Millions)

Three Ways the State Has Supported Capital Projects
Funds Used by State to Support Higher Education Projects Through 2012-13

**General Obligation Bonds** are backed by the state General Fund and approved by voters. Voters over the years have approved numerous higher education bonds. From 1986 to 2006, voters approved higher education bonds about every two years.

**Lease Revenue Bonds** also are financed with state General Fund but do not require voter approval. Because repayment is not as secure, interest rates tend to be higher for these types of bonds.

**Pay-As-You-Go** is when the state pays for the facilities with cash.

After 2012-13, the state restructured how it supported UC and CSU facilities (described on next page).

Debt Service Costs Have Increased Substantially Since 1990
Higher Education Debt Service, 2012-13 Dollars (In Millions)
State Recently Changed How It Finances University Facilities

Beginning in 2013-14 for UC and 2014-15 for CSU:

- State shifted funds for general obligation bond debt service into UC’s and CSU’s main budget appropriation.
- Segments issue their own university bonds to fund projects.
- Each segment pays all associated debt (on general obligation, lease revenue, and university bonds) using its main budget appropriation.

State Also Changed How Projects Are Approved

Old and New Timeline to Approve University Projects

In creating the new process, the Legislature ceded substantial project-approval authority to the administration.

**Old Process**
- September: Governor submits proposed projects.
- December: Legislature reviews projects.
- January: Legislature approves or rejects projects in annual budget act.

**New Process**
- UC submits proposals to Legislature and administration.
- CSU submits proposals to Legislature and administration.
- Administration submits list of projects it intends to approve. Legislature reviews projects.
- Administration submits final list of approved projects. Legislature can take further action if desired.
- June: Legislature approves or rejects projects in annual budget act.

UC and CSU Are Below Statutory Limit on Their University Bonds

Percent of Annual General Fund Spent on Debt Service as Reported by Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>CSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt service on approved university bonds</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory limit</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When granting the segments the ability to finance their own bonds, the state adopted debt limits to ensure an adequate amount of funds were available for the segments’ operating costs. General obligation and lease revenue bond debt is not included in the statutory limit. Including all bonds, debt service is 10 percent of each segment’s General Fund support.
Maintenance Is Essential for Campuses to Remain in Good Condition

Examples of Maintenance Projects

- **Replace** Roof
- **Replace** Fire Alarms
- **Replace** Heating and Cooling Systems
- **Upgrade** Sewer Lines
- **Repave** Roadways and Walkways

The state currently allows each segment to decide how much of its budget to set aside annually for maintenance.

Backlogs Can Accumulate When Campuses Do Not Do Maintenance on Schedule

Value of Maintenance Backlog as Estimated by Each Segment

- **UC** $4.4 Billion
- **CSU** $3.7 Billion
- **CCC** $6.6 Billion

When maintenance is postponed, campuses increase the risk of more costly repairs and replacements in the future.

Over Past Six Years, State Has Provided Funding to Address Backlogs

One-Time State Funding for Deferred Maintenance (In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>CCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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