



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®

# VOTER



**FREMONT, NEWARK & UNION CITY**

**March 2016**

## SAVE THESE DATES

FRIDAY, APRIL 8

6:45 P.M.

FREMONT CO-HOUSING MEETING  
FREMONT MAIN LIBRARY

See details on page 8

SUNDAY, APRIL 24

2:00 P.M.

NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION  
EVELYN'S HOME

Join us in welcoming our new members.  
Share your story of why you joined!

MO ROCCA'S FILM ON  
"ELECTORAL DYSFUNCTION"

A humorous look at politics  
Time - late April on a Friday night  
at League headquarters

FRIDAY, MAY 6

17TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
CANDIDATE FORUM

Time & Place to be announced

SATURDAY, MAY 7

9:30-12:00

LWV BAY AREA CONVENTION  
SAN MATEO CC BOARD ROOM

SATURDAY, JUNE 4TH

LWVFNUC ANNUAL MEETING

Details to follow



**Monday, March 7, 2016**

**League Office**

**3375 Country Drive**

**6:00 PM**

### **Special Member Meeting And Light Dinner**

Come and join us for a light dinner while we vote on an amendment to our Articles of Incorporation. See the February *Voter* or go to our website at [lwvfnuc.org](http://lwvfnuc.org) for a full explanation of the need for changing our Articles. The Special Member Meeting should take approximately 15 minutes. We will need a quorum for the vote!!!



### **Higher Education Consensus Meeting**

Those of you who attend the Special Member Meeting are invited to stay for the Consensus Meeting which will start after the dinner and adjournment of the Special Meeting.

**Members who attend the Special Member Meeting do not have to attend the Consensus Meeting.**

## PRESIDENTS' MESSAGE



***"If we are concerned about democracy, we would be concerned with creating an educated populace,"*** said Dr. Noam Cook, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, San Jose University at the LWVFNUC's higher education meeting. Dr. Noam Cook's talk on the nature and purpose of education provided an insightful segue way to our upcoming March 7th consensus meeting on the Higher Education study.

Dr. Cook made the observation that the impoverishment of public education has been based more on priorities than on resources. ***"The money is there,"*** he said, further pointing out that California is the 8th largest economy in the world and yet we are falling behind in our funding of public education.

The Public Policy Institute, in its report titled Higher Education in California: Institutional Costs, notes costs have not necessarily increased but have been passed on from the State to students. Moreover, the report notes, that as funding for Higher Education does not have the same constitutional protections as K-12, it is much more vulnerable to economic downturns.

During our consensus session we will discuss, debate and arrive at consensus on issues around higher education and its funding so that we can take positions on this critical topic. We look forward to your participation, do join us!

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

### Officers

Co-Presidents

Syeda Inamdar  
Pauline Weaver  
[president@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:president@lwvfnuc.org)

VP Administration  
VP Program

Miriam Keller  
Ellen Culver  
[program@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:program@lwvfnuc.org)

VP Voter Service

Sets Amann  
[voterservice@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:voterservice@lwvfnuc.org)

Secretary  
Treasurer

Mary Miller  
Peter Starr

### Directors

Membership  
Voter Editor

Evelyn La Torre  
Alex Starr  
[votered@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:votered@lwvfnuc.org)

At Large  
At Large  
At Large  
At Large  
At Large

Kathy Bray  
Carolyn Hedgecock  
Alice Johnson  
Susan Lemke  
Anu Natarajan

### Off Board

Action Group, Chair

Alex Starr  
[action@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:action@lwvfnuc.org)

Communications/Media

Sam Neeman  
[publicity@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:publicity@lwvfnuc.org)

Education Cmte. Chair  
Webmaster/Db Admin

Miriam Keller  
Peter Starr  
[webmaster@lwvfnuc.org](mailto:webmaster@lwvfnuc.org)

Nominating Cmte.

Gail Blalock, Chair  
Andrea Schacter  
Open

Published 10 times a year by the League of Women  
Voters of Fremont, Newark, and Union City  
(LWVFNUC)

PO Box 3218 Fremont, CA 94539  
Office: 3375 Country Drive, Fremont  
510-794-5783  
[www.lwvfnuc.org](http://www.lwvfnuc.org)

Editor Alex Starr

# STUDY OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

## CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

*Approved by the LWVC Board of Directors August 8, 2015*

### • PURPOSE

**Discussion Questions:** What is the purpose of California's system of public higher education? Is it to supply an educated, competitive workforce for the state? Is it to offer the benefits of postsecondary school education to everyone capable of learning? Is it to ensure that the state will have a sufficiently large segment of well-educated citizens? Is it to develop future leaders? Is the purpose to increase opportunities for economic mobility otherwise lacking for first-generation and/or minority youngsters? Is it to continue emphasis on access and excellence as core values?

**1. Among the purposes of public higher education listed below, indicate your rating of each item's importance:**

***a. to provide educational opportunities that serve the personal, professional, and/or occupational goals of students.***

1. Very important 2. Important 3. Less important  
4. Not important 5. No consensus

***b. to provide and maintain a steady stream of leadership from all sectors of society.***

1. Very important 2. Important 3. Less important  
4. Not important 5. No consensus

***c. to promote upward economic mobility across all population groups.***

1. Very important 2. Important 3. Less important  
4. Not important 5. No consensus

***d. to advance the economic and civic goals of local communities and the state.***

1. Very important 2. Important 3. Less important  
4. Not important 5. No consensus

***e. to continue to emphasize the dual values of access and excellence that were embedded in the Master Plan and are still relevant and important today.***

1. Very important 2. Important 3. Less important  
4. Not important 5. No consensus

### • EQUITABLE ACCESS

**Discussion Questions:** Should everyone, regardless of preparation for college, have access to higher education? To what extent should access be apportioned proportionally according to the state population, i.e., should there be a distinctive focus on such issues as gender, race, ethnicity, and age? In admissions? Enrollments? Completion of degrees? With the elimination of affirmative action policies, there are no longer statutory requirements regarding university admission. The Master Plan's specified criteria for eligibility still hold sway and restrict enrollment at CSU and UC. Do these criteria meet the needs of California's changing demographics? Do they facilitate a seamless transition path from the California Community Colleges (CCCs) to four-year colleges? Do they address the need for many more graduates of four-year universities?

**2. Equitable access in public higher education is evidenced by:**

***a. an increase in the diversity of enrollment and completion rates in the CCCs, CSUs, and UCs that reflects the diversity of the state's population.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***b. an increase in the initial freshman enrollment in both CSU and UC of qualified high school graduates from low income and under-represented minority groups.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***c. the provision of specialized services for at-risk students in higher education to facilitate their successful certificate or degree completion.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***d. a transparent and seamless transfer path from the CCCs to four-year colleges.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

### **• FUNDING & AFFORDABILITY**

***Discussion Questions:*** Should tuition for public higher education be free? Currently, only the CCCs do not charge tuition although they do charge “fees” per credit. The State Universities and the University of California charge both tuition and fees with exact amounts varying from year to year due to dependence on changing allocations from the state budget. In addition to this lack of stability, there are issues of affordability for students and families, especially for those with special needs, e.g., for remediation, for assistance due to disabilities, and for those who have to interrupt their studies to seek gainful employment. Assistance through financial aid is available to those qualified, but is it sufficient? Are the tuition and fees charged an obstacle for students and families? How can students cover the full cost of attending college, which is much more than just tuition and fees? What is the state’s responsibility for assisting students for whom affordability is an issue?

### **3. In funding California’s system of public higher education:**

***a. the state should pay for all higher education tuition and fees.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***b. government and students or their families should share the full cost of attendance in public higher education based on their ability to pay.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***c. the state should provide additional funding for services for students with special needs, such as students with disabilities, aged out foster care students, and veterans.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***d. the state should provide stable and predictable funding that is sustainable, adequate, and timely to support public higher education.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***e. the state should develop additional funding streams to support public higher education.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***f. a broad based tax should be levied to specifically increase state funding for public higher education.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

### **4. California’s financial aid policies should:**

***a. ensure that higher education attendance, including tuition, fees, housing, transportation, books, or other educational materials, is affordable for all students regardless of their family’s financial circumstances.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***b. provide that student and family share of the full costs of attendance be reasonably proportionate to their discretionary income.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***c. include effective counseling to enable students to plan and access financing for their college education.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4.  
Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

## • PREPAREDNESS

**Discussion Questions:** How well are K-12 students prepared for higher education? Is there adequate counseling? Should students be able to start earning college credits while still in high school? Do students and families have sufficient knowledge about enrollment procedures and the availability of financial aid? Will the implementation of current K-12 school reforms be sufficient to prepare students to meet college-readiness criteria? Other reforms and opportunities available to assist students in mastering the requirements have been suggested. Which of these seem appropriate or useful? How essential is K-12 preparedness?

### 5. To increase student success:

***a. when students graduate from high school, they should be prepared for college-level coursework or career/occupational employment.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***b. the state should support programs that foster coordination between and among school districts and colleges, with a focus on better utilization of the senior year of high school, to ensure that more students graduate from high school prepared for college-level work without needing remediation.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***c. California should expand opportunities for more high school students, especially students from under-represented groups, to begin earning college credits in high school, for example by taking Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and/or dual or concurrent enrollment classes.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***d. services should be available to ensure that at-risk, low income, and under-represented minority students are advised about the wide range of appropriate career and college opportunities.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***e. outreach to disadvantaged, low income, minority, and first generation students is needed to encourage college applications for admission and financial aid.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

## • OPPORTUNITIES/BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

**Discussion Questions:** Limited capacity and strict adherence to the 1960 eligibility requirements for four-year colleges have contributed to California's low baccalaureate attainment. Lack of articulation and coordination among the three sectors has also created barriers to student access and success. Many students experience barriers to enrollment and successful completion of their degrees in post-secondary education, while others lack opportunities for lifelong learning as well as training or retraining. Some reforms and opportunities have been made available or proposed to assist students in meeting eligibility requirements, such as: the use of multiple measures of assessment for entry placement status, the development of a variety of innovative curricula and instructional strategies, development of satellite locations offering B.A. degrees, and the use of new and expanding technologies. Are they enough? Are they effective?

**6. California should utilize multiple strategies and models to increase baccalaureate degree attainment and coordination of the three sectors, such as:**

***a. increase CSU and UC enrollment capacity to serve more transfers and entering freshman.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus



***b. allow more CCCs to offer four-year programs with B.A./B.S. attainment.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***c. promote the implementation and evaluation of evidence-based improvements in curriculum, instruction, and placement to enhance student success and degree attainment.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***d. promote greater flexibility among the three sectors' eligibility requirements to increase student access for transfer and completion of four-year degrees.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***e. develop university centers and/or university branches to increase access to baccalaureate degree attainment.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***f. increase articulation among the three higher education sectors to construct curriculum pathways helping students to transfer smoothly to four-year colleges, for degree attainment of baccalaureate degrees.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***g. develop a longitudinal student database to track enrollment, transfer, and completion rates across all three sectors and provide feedback to high schools.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***h. expand the use of new technologies, including online education, to the extent that they expand access and success for students.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***i. provide credit and non-credit adult education courses that support life-long learning and provide opportunities for training/retraining that can lead to better jobs and/or postsecondary education.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***j. provide programs leading to Certification in Career Technical Education to fulfill labor needs and enable people to be trained/retrained for meaningful jobs that do not require a bachelor's degree.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***k. create a mechanism, such as an oversight body, to provide coordination and articulation among the three sectors, to continuously evaluate the functioning and efficacy of higher education as a system, and to provide non-partisan analysis and recommendations for improvement.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

***l. maintain a comprehensive system of post-secondary education/higher education that will have viable access points for all adult Californians, including such populations as disabled students, incarcerated students, veterans, Dreamers, those seeking to re-train or change careers, and older adults.***

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree 5. No consensus

**7. GENERAL COMMENTS: (150 words or less)**

Please use the space below to add any general comments or ideas about public higher education in California that were not already addressed in some prior comments, in the Consensus Questions and/or in the Study Guide.

**APRIL 15TH REMINDER!**

Remember that your dues and contributions to the League are all tax deductible

**WE NEED MORE VOLUNTEERS FOR THE AUDIT COMMITTEE!!!**

Contact Peter Starr  
<mailto:treasurer@lwvfnuc.org>

## EMPOWERING THE VOTERS OF TOMORROW

### High School Voter Registration



Voter registration is critical to spurring young people to get involved. Census data tells us that approximately three quarter of young people who register end up turning out to vote in major elections years. Yet according to analysis by the Center for Information and Research of Civic Learning and Engagement only about half of all young people voted in 2012. Too many young people report that it is lack of information and access which keeps them on the sidelines at election time. Registration and education is the key to unlocking the potential for millions of young voter.

Alameda County Registrar of Voters and League of Women Voters of Fremont, Newark, Union City are working with High Schools in Fremont, Newark, & Union City in offering classes in: Youth Voter Registration, Importance of Voting, and use of SMART Voter to get information regarding current election. Through thoughtful collaboration, we hope we can inspire young people to become active and engaged leader for tomorrow.

Sets Amann (LWV-Voter Service Chair)

---

### From LWVC

### Preview of Pros & Cons for 2016

Currently there is one (1) initiative on the June 2016 ballot. That initiative is Prop 50 relating to suspension of pay of legislators who are suspended due to criminal investigations. There is a possibility that the legislature will put a second initiative, a school bond issue, on the June 2016 ballot. The *Easy Voter Guide* and *Pros & Cons* will be relatively short.

However, there is a potential for 16 to 20 ballot initiatives to be on the November 2016 ballot. There is a wide variety of potential initiatives, from a repeal of a paper bag ban to parental notification of a minor's intent to have an abortion, to a public vote on publicly financed projects, to allowing recreational use of marijuana, and many other subjects.

*Pros & Cons* Ballot-Measure Writer/Researchers are wanted for the November 2016 edition. This

is perfect for those who like to dig into the meat of ballot initiatives. Our writers and researchers draft the *Pros & Cons* according to a set format, based on the material in the Secretary of State's Official Voter Information Guide. Next comes the drafting of the *In-Depth* by researching additional background information for use by our speakers. In this phase additional research of information that is not in the Legislative Analyst's material, including such things as: lists of supporters and opponents, additional arguments, information on how much money is being spent on the campaign by both sides. The editor and other reviewers provide guidance to the writer. ***The work is done in the months prior to the November election and writers must be available to begin work in July.***

If interested, contact [Sandy Wolber](#), Editor.

## Experts in Building Community to Speak in Fremont

### Mission Peak Cohousing and City of Fremont Host Public Presentation

For the first time in the tri-city area, internationally known cohousing experts and award-winning architects Charles Durrett and Kathryn McCamant will present an overview of the cohousing concept of building community on Friday evening, April 8 in the Fukaya Room at Fremont Main library.

Cohousing is a term used to describe the old/new idea of neighbors intentionally creating the best aspects of small-town living—living in privately owned homes in neighborhoods designed to stimulate community interaction. Some describe it as a new response to the social, economic, and sustainability challenges of the 21st century.

“My own interest in cohousing dates back to a remark my mother made,” recalls League member Jane Mueller. “She and Dad lived out their hope of aging in place, but they became increasingly isolated in their own home after they and their friends could no longer drive. Mom remarked, ‘By the time you’re our age, you baby boomers will figure out a better way to do this.’”

“The whole idea of these neighborhoods is to have as much fun as you can possibly have,” says Durrett. “The friendlier and more fun the neighborhood, the greener the lifestyle, and the smaller the footprint.”

While living in Denmark and attending the Royal Academy of Art and Architecture, Durrett and McCamant were intrigued by distinctively friendly, inviting, active neighborhoods called “living communities” and began studying them. They brought the idea to the U.S. about 25 years ago and since then have designed and consulted in 50 cohousing communities. Now there are more than 150 cohousing

neighborhoods in the U.S. and Canada—mostly multi-generational—and almost 100 more in some stage of formation.

One of those forming groups is Mission Peak Cohousing, the group that is co-sponsoring the April 8 presentation with the City of Fremont. The presentation will be followed by a “Getting-It-Built” weekend workshop for individuals and families interested in pursuing a cohousing neighborhood in the Fremont area.

#### EVENT DETAILS:

##### **Cohousing: Neighbors Building Neighborhoods**

Friday, April 8, 6:45 pm.

Fremont Main Library, 2400 Stevenson Blvd., Fremont  
Open to the public without charge

##### **Getting It Built—A Weekend Workshop on Cohousing** (Saturday-Sunday, April 9-10)

*Topics:* The Cohousing Process (organizing & roles); Technical Issues (financing & designing); Working Together (decision making & group interaction); and What Next (next steps to get it built).

*Enrollment:* Limited to 30 potential residents and developers interested in building a cohousing community. Fee: \$400 pre-registration only, deadline March 31, 2016; earlybird discount \$350 available if postmarked by March 22. Make check payable to Mission Peak Cohousing and mail to Doug Ford, 35366 Ronda Ct., Fremont, CA 94536.

*For more information on presentation and workshop:*

[MissionPeakCohousing@gmail.com](mailto:MissionPeakCohousing@gmail.com)

*For more information on the topic of cohousing:*

[www.cohousing.org](http://www.cohousing.org)



*Photos:* McCamant & Durrett Architects/The Cohousing Company (left to right) Nevada City Cohousing, Nevada City, CA; Sacramento Street Senior Housing, Berkeley, CA; Bellingham Cohousing, Bellingham, WA; Silver Sage Senior Cohousing, Boulder, CO.



Mon, Mar 7	Special Member Meeting and Higher Ed Consensus Meeting	6:00 PM Soup and Special Member Meeting 6:30 PM Consensus Meeting 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
Thur, Mar 10	Action Group	11:00 AM – 1:00 PM 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
Mon, Mar 21	Board Meeting	6:45 PM League Office 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
Fri, Apr 8	Cohousing Meeting	6:45 PM Fremont Main Library 2800 Stevenson Blvd.
Thur, Apr 14	Action Group	11:00 AM – 1:00 PM 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
Mon, Apr 18	Board Meeting	6:45 PM League Office 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
Sunday, Apr 24	New Member Orientation Meeting	2:00 PM Evelyn La Torre's Home

ALL MEETINGS ARE FREE, OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AND WHEEL CHAIR ACCESSIBLE

### Mission

The League of Women Voters of Fremont, Newark, and Union City, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

### Diversity Policy

LWVFNUC affirms its commitment to reflect the diversity of our communities in our membership and actions. We believe diverse views are important for responsible decision making and seek to work with all people and groups who reflect our community diversity.

## Join the LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS TODAY!

Any person, man or woman, who subscribes to the purpose and policy of the League may join. To be a voting member, one must be at least 18 years of age and a U.S. citizen. Members under 18, or non-citizens, are welcome as non-voting Associate Members. Dues include membership in LWVFNUC, Bay Area League, and the California and National Leagues. Financial support for dues is available through our scholarship program. Contact Evelyn La Torre, Membership Chair, for information.

*LWVFNUC is a 501 (c) (3)  
Organization. Please make your  
check payable to: LWVFNUC and  
mail it with this form to:*

LWVFNUC-MEMBERSHIP  
P. O. Box 3218  
Fremont, CA 94539

☐ Individual Membership—\$60  
☐ Household Membership—\$90

Donation \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Total Enclosed \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Name (s) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ New Member ☐ Renewal

☐ Transfer from \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

**OR GO ONLINE AT [LWVFNUC.ORG](http://LWVFNUC.ORG)!**

LWFNUC  
P.O. Box 3218  
Fremont, CA. 94539