
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1871
Author: Fong (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/17/26

AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil instruction: dual enrollment: College and Career Access
Pathways partnerships

SOURCE: Hispanas Organized for Political Equality

DIGEST: This bill changes the College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) dual enrollment program by removing the requirement that participating students obtain a principal recommendation, requiring CCAP agreements to permit students to complete a single community college application for the duration of their participation, eliminating the existing limit of four college courses per term while retaining the 15-unit cap, and revising state reporting requirements to emphasize student outcomes.

Senate floor amendments of 8/28/26 add the Education Commissioner to the list of entities to which the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges is required to submit the annual CCAP report.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes community college districts to enter into a CCAP partnership agreements with school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to expand dual enrollment opportunities for students who may not already be college-bound or who are underrepresented in higher education. (Education Code (EC) § 76004)
- 2) Requires CCAP partnership agreements to be approved by the governing boards of participating entities and to include specified provisions related to courses offered, information sharing, facilities use, and student participation. (EC § 76004)
- 3) Requires, as part of CCAP participation protocols, parental consent and a principal recommendation, and provides that participating students need only submit one parental consent form and principal recommendation during their participation in the partnership. (EC § 76004)
- 4) Requires the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to revise the special part-time student application process so that a student participating in a CCAP partnership may complete a single community college application for the duration of participation. (EC § 76004)
- 5) Authorizes a student participating in a CCAP partnership to enroll in up to 15 units per term if specified conditions are met, provided those units constitute no more than four community college courses per term. (EC § 76004)
- 6) Requires participating community college districts and local educational agencies to annually report specified participation and completion data to the Chancellor's Office, including enrollment, course-taking, course completion, and full-time equivalent students (FTES) information. (EC § 76004)

This bill:

- 1) Deletes the requirement that CCAP participation protocols require a student to obtain a recommendation from the principal to participate in a CCAP partnership.
- 2) Requires CCAP partnership agreements to establish protocols authorizing participating students to complete a single community college application for the duration of their attendance as a special part-time student under the CCAP partnership.

- 3) Removes the existing limitation that restricts CCAP students enrolled under the 15-unit exception to no more than four community college courses per term.
- 4) Retains the existing 15-unit maximum per term for participating students.
- 5) Revises annual reporting requirements by replacing the requirement to report the total number of community college courses taken by CCAP participants with outcome-oriented measures.
- 6) Requires annual reporting of the total number of participating students who:
 - a) Successfully complete 12 or more units of college coursework before graduation;
 - b) Complete a certificate; or
 - c) Complete the coursework required for an associate degree or an associate degree for transfer.
- 7) Requires reporting of successful course completions by instructional modality, including online and in-person coursework.
- 8) Adds the Education Commissioner to the list of entities to which the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges is required to submit the annual CCAP report.

Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, “CCAP program was established to enable high school students to take college courses at their school sites, easing logistical barriers. CCAP is an invaluable resource for high school students, setting students up for success in both their academic and professional lives. Despite the benefits of dual enrollment programs, dual enrollment participation has not been equitable for all students. According to the CCCCCO, participation rates were measured at 13.9% among white students, 10.9% among Latino students, and 10.8% among the socioeconomically disadvantaged.

“AB 1871 will ensure more equitable access to dual enrollment opportunities for all students by streamlining the application process so that a student completes only one application for the duration of their attendance at a

community college as a unique part-time student participating in a CCAP agreement. This will avoid confusion of the application process and remove an unnecessary hurdle that limits access to dual enrollment opportunities. To address potential bias in application approvals, this bill will also remove the requirement that the school principal approves a student's CCAP application. Applicants from certain racial or ethnic backgrounds may be unfairly favored or discriminated against, which has led to biased outcomes in approving applications. Furthermore, this bill will eliminate the four community college courses per term limit to give students flexibility in meeting the current 15-unit cap on dual enrollment courses. By removing this restriction, students can accumulate more college credits while still in high school, easing the transition to college and reducing future tuition costs. Lastly, AB 1871 will streamline the CCAP reporting requirements so that more outcome-driven data is collected to evaluate the program effectively.”

- 2) *Continued legislative interest in expanding dual enrollment participation.* Over the last decade, the Legislature has made significant investments in dual enrollment as a strategy to improve college access, accelerate postsecondary attainment, and strengthen college and career pathways. Those efforts include the creation of the CCAP framework in 2015, subsequent statutory refinements, and more recent state investments through the Golden State Pathways Program and Dual Enrollment Funding Opportunity Program. Participation has grown substantially during that period, with nearly 150,000 California students participating in dual enrollment by the Class of 2024. Research consistently finds that students who participate in dual enrollment are more likely to enroll in college, accumulate postsecondary credits, and complete degrees.

This bill continues that policy trend by focusing on administrative barriers that stakeholders argue may discourage student participation without directly advancing academic goals.

- 3) *Administrative streamlining versus local discretion.* Several provisions of this bill seek to simplify participation in CCAP partnerships. Requiring students to repeatedly complete community college applications and obtain principal recommendations may create additional administrative steps that vary across local partnerships. This bill therefore standardizes certain participation procedures and reduces local gatekeeping requirements.

At the same time, the Legislature may wish to consider whether the principal recommendation requirement serves any meaningful purpose within the CCAP

framework. Existing law already requires parental consent and local partnership agreements approved by governing boards. If principal recommendations are rarely used to screen students or identify readiness concerns, their removal may have little practical effect. Conversely, if some districts rely on principal recommendations as part of local student support and advising processes, the bill would reduce local discretion in favor of a more uniform statewide approach.

- 4) *Aligning reporting requirements with student outcomes.* Current law primarily emphasizes participation metrics, such as enrollment levels, courses taken, and course completion rates. This bill shifts part of the reporting framework toward student outcomes, including completion of at least 12 college units, certificates, and coursework leading to associate degrees or associate degrees for transfer.

This change reflects a broader policy question regarding how the success of dual enrollment programs should be measured. While participation data remains useful for understanding access and scale, outcome measures may provide a clearer picture of whether students are progressing along meaningful postsecondary pathways. The additional data required by this bill could help policymakers evaluate not only how many students participate in CCAP partnerships, but also whether those experiences are translating into measurable academic progress before high school graduation.

- 5) *Course limits and accelerated pathways.* Current law allows CCAP students to enroll in up to 15 units per term but separately limits those units to no more than four college courses. Because many community college courses carry three units, the four-course restriction can effectively prevent some students from fully utilizing the 15-unit authorization.

By removing the course-count limitation while retaining the overall unit cap, the bill creates greater flexibility for students enrolled in structured pathways designed to lead to certificates, credentials, or degree completion. The change appears intended to better align statutory course limits with the Legislature's growing interest in accelerated college and career pathways that allow students to accumulate meaningful postsecondary credit while still in high school.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: No

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

This bill could result in annual Proposition 98 General Fund costs, potentially in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for additional state apportionments due to increased CCAP enrollment and program participation. However, the bill's exact costs would depend on the number of new students that participate and the number of courses being taken.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Hispanas Organized for Political Equality (source)
Advanced Consulting, LLC
Alameda County Office of Education
Alliance for a Better Community
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Black Women Organized for Political Action
Blu Educational Foundation
California Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships
California Catholic Conference
California Charter Schools Association
California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office
California Community Foundation
California EDGE Coalition
Campaign for College Opportunity
Career Ladders Project
Career Launch Path
Central American Resource Center of California
Children Now
College for All Coalition
Community College League of California
Consejo de Federaciones Mexicanas
EdTrust-West
Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
Future Leaders of America
Go Public Schools
Immigrants Rising
Innercity Struggle
Journey House
Just Equations
Kid City Hope Place
Latino and Latina Roundtable of the San Gabriel and Pomona Valley
Latino Education Advancement Foundation

Linked Learning Alliance
Long Beach Community College District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles Urban Foundation
Mission Graduates
NextGen California
Prismatic Research & Strategy
Puente Learning Center
San Diego Unified School District
Small School Districts Association
Southern California College Attainment Network
Student Senate for California Community Colleges
The RP Group
uAspire
UC Student Association
Unite-LA
University of California Student Association
Young Invincibles

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Garcia, Lackey, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/31/26 0:07:33

**** END ****