

## Summary of Stakeholder Recommendations

	Base Grant (Basic allocation, FTES)	Supplemental Grant (Socio- Economic)	Success Grant (Completion Metrics)	Hold Harmless	Other
Independent Comments from CEOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urge the base rate for noncredit be the same as the Credit and CDCP rates.</li> <li>Urge if the stability option and shifting of summer FTES is eliminated future calculations tied to enrollment should be based on a multi-year average.</li> <li>Use rolling averages to set baseline data.</li> <li>Build additional funding into the basic allocation for all colleges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drop the weighting factors related to BOG and Pell grants awarded.</li> <li>Provide an element of funding for colleges that serve their local communities.</li> <li>Eliminate Pell as a measure and roll it into BOG.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urge consideration of a broader student success definitions and using a multi-year average for those calculations.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will reductions in faculty and staff help colleges increase their efforts to improve student success?</li> <li>Create a model that is easy to understand and replicate.</li> <li>Build a soft landing path to ensure that colleges are not suddenly facing substantial funding declines.</li> </ul>
Single College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use weighted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25% bump for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hold Harmless</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend</li> </ul>

<b>Districts</b>	<p>FTES over 3 years</p>	<p>minority groups is not sufficient and must be increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult Education needs strategic planning and to be properly funded, or we will not be able to address the very needs the Governor is trying to address.</li> <li>• Serving local students should be recognized.</li> </ul>	<p>Improvement Funding – not Performance Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Key Performance Indicators (KPI) such as retention, term to term retention, transfer, achievement of math and English sequence, etc.</li> <li>• Use multiple measures of KPI</li> <li>• Retention</li> <li>• Certificates must have standards to increase wage gain or increase transfer opportunity</li> </ul>	<p>clause should be for three (3) years and should include COLA so that colleges are truly held harmless</p>	<p>different percentages within sub-groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many factors rely on MIS data, which does not receive the same attention as an audited 320. Time and effort to cleanup data.</li> </ul>
<b>League</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase to the district basic allocation.</li> <li>• Add an increase to the noncredit rate. Noncredit students do not receive BOG or Pell and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a milestone/progress metric such as English and Math or 30 units.</li> <li>• Consider transfer-prepared.</li> <li>• Include skills gained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend hold harmless to 2020-21.</li> <li>• Include COLA in the 2018-19 hold harmless.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase-in some portions of the formula consistent with major funding changes for other segments of education.</li> <li>• Apply stability to</li> </ul>

	<p>therefore are not considered in Supplemental Grants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a one-year hold harmless for FTES but adjust enrollment declines based on a 2-year average. A district should have up to 3 years to earn back the funding if it can increase its enrollment.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the correlation between the supplemental (socio-economic) metrics and the success of low-income students?</li> </ul>		<p>TCR.</p>
<p>FACCC</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half the remaining percentage devoted to education of lower income and underrepresented students based on a blended formula of: 1) Promise Grant and Pell Grants; 2) Enrollment of foster youth,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final percentage devoted to recognized practices that contribute to student success. This would be a blended formula of a district's progress toward: 1) 75/25 full- to part-time faculty ratio; 2) Part-time faculty equity (including office</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for a one-year delay to provide recommendations</li> </ul>

		<p>welfare-to-work, active military and military veterans, and regional unemployment rate; 3) Participation in DSPS, EOPS/CARE/NextUp, CalWORKs and other statewide support programs.</p>	<p>hours and health benefits); 3) Academic counselor to student ratios.</p>		
<p><b>Region 9</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand the intent of limiting the flexibility of summer FTE to eliminate “gaming” the system and stabilization, but there are other ways to achieve that same outcome that would also allow for districts to smooth enrollment due</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If districts are already spending 80 to 85% on personnel, would it not be more appropriate to only target performance funding on discretionary areas of the budget?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a longer hold harmless period to study impacts and to make adjustments where dramatic inequities have been created and mitigate where warranted.</li> <li>There is a need to address labor laws and codes to allow colleges the flexibility to modify the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is concurrence that their needs to be a change in the way CC’s are funded.</li> <li>The implementation time-frame is unnecessarily rushed, and as a consequence potentially significantly flawed and creates substantial</li> </ul>

	<p>to minor deviations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There still needs to be some consideration for areas such as Region 9 that will experience greater growth. It is also important to note that this growth includes underserved populations that are seeking more affordable housing in the region.</li> </ul>			<p>workforce in a timely fashion if a college/district suffers significant adverse financial actions and needs to take action to stabilize finances.</p>	<p>inequities among colleges. Slow the implementation down and do it right and not just fast.</p>
<p><b>Region 6</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of equity and performance fail to take into account the realities of those of us serving areas such rural/coastal.</li> <li>• Our BOG data is sufficient to show the equity gaps on campus.</li> <li>• Distribution of equity funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many factors impact the transfer success component of the funding formula and many of these are out of our hands regardless of how successful we are at preparing students.</li> <li>• More comfortable with degree/certificate</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamental flaw in the funding approach is the one-size fits all approach that is taken.</li> </ul>

		<p>should be based on the equity needs defined by students within the district's service area.</p>	<p>completion as a metric for the funding formula.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A "transfer-prepared" metric would be a much more level playing field.</li> <li>• Not all eligible transfer applicants are accepted</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Region 4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What funding can be relied on for the base? Is the "approximate 50%" the lowest threshold? Could it be higher in the first year (75%) and then scaled in the first 2-3 years so that districts could adjust?</li> <li>• What is the impact for basic aid districts and their margins...would the new funding for mula cause a shift?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the plan if districts have a difficult time meeting the outcomes with enrollment decline?</li> <li>• Has enough research been conducted on the AAT programs to ensure that students are completing as intended?</li> <li>• What "best practices" in completion based funding used in creating this model from other CC's?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a sense of uncertainty, a need for finite definition of terms.</li> <li>• What will be the impact of the 50% law and the FON if a district's funding is impacted by the formula.</li> <li>• How will we know if the new formula is working - 2 years out; 4 years out; how will it be evaluated?</li> </ul>

<b>Region 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold harmless FTES</li> <li>• Impact of stability swing timing and potential for a rolling three year</li> <li>• Growth potential (restoration limited % gain)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions for equity and special populations in different areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitioning the framework over time as growth slows and completion increases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold harmless funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freeze on FON &amp; 50% for a transitional period</li> </ul>