

Membership

Academic Senate

Kaycea Campbell
Donald Gauthier*
Jeff Hernandez
Leslie Milke
Josh Miller
Dan Wanner

Faculty Guild

Sandra Lee
John McDowell
Armida Ornelas
Olga Shewfelt
John Sikora
Joanne Waddell

Unions/Association

Kathleen Becket
Velma Butler
Vi Ly
Leila Menzies
Hao Xie
Vacant-Build& Const Trade

College Presidents

Kathleen F. Burke*
Erika A. Endrijonas
Larry Frank
Otto W. Lee
Marvin Martinez
Renee Martinez
Monte Perez
Linda D. Rose
Robert Sprague**

**STUDENT TRUSTEE
REPRESENTATIVE**

Bryant Woodert

* Co-chairs

**Interim

**District Budget Committee
July 27, 2016
1:30 pm – 3:30 pm
Educational Services Center, Board Room**

1. Call to Order (*Co-Chair Mr. Don Gauthier*)
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes for June 29, 2016
4. Chancellor's Remarks/Updates
5. ECDBC Reports and Recommendations
6. 2015-16 FTES Final
7. 2016-17 Preliminary FTES Targets
8. 2016-17 Final Budget Development
9. DBC Recommendations to the Chancellor
10. Items to Be Addressed by ECDBC

*Future DBC Meetings: Aug 17, Sep 14, Oct 12, Nov 9, Dec 14, Jan 18, Feb 15,
Mar 15, Apr 12, May 17, Jun 14*

*Future ECDBC Meetings: Aug 2, Aug 23, Sep 27, Oct 25, Nov 29, Jan 3, Jan 31,
Feb 28, Mar 28, May 2, May 30*

Los Angeles Community College District

District Budget Committee Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)

June 29, 2016

1:30-3:30 pm, Educational Services Center, Board Room

Roll Call X Indicates Present

Academic Senate

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Kaycea Campbell | X |
| Donald Gauthier* | X |
| Jeff Hernandez | X |
| Leslie Milke | X |
| Josh Miller | |
| Dan Wanner | X |

L.A. Faculty Guild

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Sandra Lee | X |
| John McDowell | |
| Armida Ornelas | X |
| Olga Shewfelt | X |
| John Sikora | X |
| Joanne Waddell | X |

Unions/Association

| | |
|--|---|
| Kathleen Becket; SEIU Local 99 | X |
| Velma Butler/Shirley Chen Page; AFT Staff Guild | X |
| Vi Ly; Local 911 Teamster | |
| Leila Menzies; Class Mgmt Rep | X |
| Hao Xie; Sup Rep Local 721 | X |
| Vacant-Build & Trade | |

College Presidents

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Kathleen F. Burke* | X |
| Erika A. Endrijonas (Mike Lee) | X |
| Larry Frank (Leticia Barajas) | X |
| Otto W. Lee (Bob Suppelsa) | X |
| Marvin Martinez | X |
| Renee Martinez | X |
| Monte Perez | X |
| Linda D. Rose | X |
| Robert Sprague** | X |

Student Trustee Rep

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Bryant Woodert (Lavel Berry) | X |
|------------------------------|---|

* DBC CO-chairs

** Interim

Also Present

Resource Persons

Ryan Cornner
Jeanette Gordon
Deborah La Teer
Bob Miller
Maury Pearl

Guests

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| John al-Amin | Paulina Palomino |
| Violet Amrikhas | Rolf Schleicher |
| Bill Gasper | David Serrano |
| Kevin Jeter | Sarah Song |

1. **Call to Order** by DBC Co-Chair Mr. Marvin Martinez at 1:35 pm.
2. **M/S/P Agenda** – Approved with no changes
3. **M/S/P Approval of Minutes** – Approved with no changes
4. **Chancellor’s Remarks/Updates** (*Dr. Rodriguez*)
 - LAUSD – Our District has been working over the last six months with LAUSD to codify and to refresh an MOU that details how our districts will work together.
 - Facilities Needs Assessment – Chancellor invites the members of DBC to attend meetings on July 13, 2016 and July 20, 2016 for District Facility discussions. It is likely that the Board will vote at the July 20, 2016 meeting to authorize a Bond to go on the November ballot.

 - Accreditation – We expect to hear from the ACCJC on July 8 2016 regarding the reaffirmation status of each of our colleges.
5. **ECDBC Reports and Recommendations** (*Gordon*)
 - Proposed Calendar was discussed.
 - Allocation Model and Scenarios were discussed. Simulations showed cost of instruction, cost of faculty, and cost of utilities inserted into minimum base. An additional scenario of cost of IT will be presented at the next ECDBC meeting.
 - Enrollment Management Committee – recommend that this committee be a part of the District Planning Committee. At its July 29 meeting, DPC will discuss this new charge.
 - Reserves- recommend no change to the current policy.
6. **DBC Co-Chairs Elections**
 - Effective July 1, 2016
 - Faculty Co- Chair unanimous vote for Don Gauthier
 - Administrative Co-Chair unanimous vote for Kathleen F. Burke
7. **Adopt 2016-17 DBC Meeting Calendar**
 - Approved DBC meeting dates with no changes.
 - Approved ECDBC meeting dates with change of August meeting to be August 23.
8. **2015-16 Year End Balance Projection** (*Gordon*)
 - The most recent ending balance projects the District will have over 10% ending balance. These numbers do not include any redistribution of ending balances; the ending balances by college will change.
 - A request was made to include projections of those items that are redistributed, such as centralized services and contingency reserve.
9. **State Budget Update** (*Gordon*)
 - The final signed budget shows a reduction in scheduled maintenance and instructional equipment and an increase in part time office hours and Puente/Mesa/ CalWORKs categorical funds; a net \$1.85m reduction to LACCD.
10. **Enrollment Update** (*Corner*)

- Final numbers for 2015-16 are not complete, but preliminary runs suggest the District will meet P2 projections. In order to meet the 3% 2015-16 growth target, 1,100 more FTES from Summer I was used in 2015-16 than the prior year.
- The College Presidents at having discussions at Presidents Council regarding the targets for 2016-17.
- The Final budget will distribute 2% in growth to the colleges.

11. JLMBC/Wellness Program Proposal

- Ms. Palomino gave a brief recap of the Wellness Proposal and requests \$1,081,400 to be budgeted in the 2016-17 year.
- This item was approved with a vote of: 12 yes, 8 no, 3 abstain.

12. DBC Recommendations to the Chancellor

- None

13. Items to be addressed by ECDBC

- Review of Budget Allocation Model

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Future Meetings: Aug 17, Sep 14, Oct 12, Nov 9, Dec 14, Jan 18, Feb 15, Mar 15, Apr 12, May 17, Jun 14

FALL 2016: Credit Enrollment Comparison

Day

Day relative to beginning of instruction

**Census day for
Fall 2016 is
September 12**

Tuesday, July 26, 2016

-34

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

| HEADCOUNT | | District | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade | Valley | West | ITV |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| Fall 2016 | | 101,190 | 11,931 | 20,961 | 6,653 | 7,735 | 16,189 | 4,616 | 9,950 | 14,434 | 8,402 | 319 |
| Fall 2015 | | 107,684 | 13,373 | 21,371 | 7,600 | 8,259 | 16,999 | 5,154 | 11,211 | 14,911 | 8,379 | 427 |
| Fall 2014 | | 113,845 | 14,612 | 21,848 | 8,118 | 8,891 | 18,204 | 5,295 | 11,805 | 15,913 | 8,682 | 477 |
| 2016 % of 2015 | | 94% | 89% | 98% | 88% | 94% | 95% | 90% | 89% | 97% | 100% | 75% |
| 2016 % of 2014 | | 89% | 82% | 96% | 82% | 87% | 89% | 87% | 84% | 91% | 97% | 67% |

| ENROLLMENT | | District | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade | Valley | West | ITV |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Fall 2016 | | 260,125 | 31,242 | 55,423 | 18,161 | 19,254 | 42,357 | 11,198 | 24,262 | 36,776 | 21,037 | 415 |
| Fall 2015 | | 280,985 | 35,798 | 57,449 | 21,350 | 21,103 | 45,327 | 12,773 | 27,065 | 38,579 | 21,033 | 508 |
| Fall 2014 | | 300,552 | 40,090 | 58,675 | 23,240 | 22,754 | 49,299 | 13,086 | 28,600 | 42,117 | 22,060 | 631 |
| 2016 % of 2015 | | 93% | 87% | 96% | 85% | 91% | 93% | 88% | 90% | 95% | 100% | 82% |
| 2016 % of 2014 | | 87% | 78% | 94% | 78% | 85% | 86% | 86% | 85% | 87% | 95% | 66% |

| SECTION COUNT | | District | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade | Valley | West | ITV |
|-----------------------|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Fall 2016 | | 11,304 | 1,390 | 2,223 | 1,005 | 708 | 1,660 | 591 | 1,163 | 1,578 | 968 | 18 |
| Fall 2015 | | 10,882 | 1,523 | 2,070 | 958 | 678 | 1,633 | 557 | 1,138 | 1,483 | 824 | 18 |
| Fall 2014 | | 10,488 | 1,506 | 1,914 | 958 | 634 | 1,611 | 556 | 1,061 | 1,443 | 788 | 17 |
| 2016 % of 2015 | | 104% | 91% | 107% | 105% | 104% | 102% | 106% | 102% | 106% | 117% | 100% |
| 2016 % of 2014 | | 108% | 92% | 116% | 105% | 112% | 103% | 106% | 110% | 109% | 123% | 106% |

| Enrollment divided by Section | | District | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade | Valley | West | ITV |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Fall 2016 | | 23.0 | 22.5 | 24.9 | 18.1 | 27.2 | 25.5 | 18.9 | 20.9 | 23.3 | 21.7 | 23.1 |
| Fall 2015 | | 25.8 | 23.5 | 27.8 | 22.3 | 31.1 | 27.8 | 22.9 | 23.8 | 26.0 | 25.5 | 28.2 |
| Fall 2014 | | 28.7 | 26.6 | 30.7 | 24.3 | 35.9 | 30.6 | 23.5 | 27.0 | 29.2 | 28.0 | 37.1 |
| 2016 % of 2015 | | 89% | 96% | 90% | 81% | 87% | 92% | 83% | 88% | 90% | 85% | 82% |
| 2016 % of 2014 | | 80% | 84% | 81% | 74% | 76% | 83% | 81% | 77% | 80% | 78% | 62% |

Source: LACCD Student Information System, DAILYCRNRX and SESSION_FTES_DETAIL tables.
Includes Ind Study, PA, DSCH, and WSCH. Excludes Work Exp, Non-Apportionment Generating, Non-Credit Adult Ed, and Non-Credit Tutoring.

2015-16 Annual Apportionment Attendance Report

Apportionment FTES

| | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade-Tech | Valley | West | ITV | Total |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------|----------------|
| credit | 287 | 2,170 | 339 | 270 | 1,435 | 248 | 558 | 82 | 85 | 0 | 5,476 |
| non-credit enhanced | 60 | 71 | 7 | 3 | 28 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 23 | 0 | 229 |
| | 82 | 631 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 168 | 21 | 58 | 10 | 0 | 976 |
| Summer 2015/2 | 429 | 2,872 | 346 | 278 | 1,463 | 289 | 738 | 146 | 119 | 0 | 6,680 |
| credit | 5,384 | 9,890 | 3,271 | 2,944 | 6,615 | 2,138 | 5,354 | 5,781 | 3,129 | 142 | 44,649 |
| non-credit enhanced | 174 | 189 | 29 | 141 | 14 | 70 | 26 | 26 | 134 | 0 | 872 |
| | 224 | 211 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 269 | 277 | 300 | 48 | 0 | 1,387 |
| Fall 2015 | 5,782 | 10,291 | 3,300 | 3,096 | 6,756 | 2,422 | 5,701 | 6,107 | 3,311 | 142 | 46,908 |
| credit | 623 | 1,379 | 172 | 252 | 766 | 411 | 648 | 654 | 443 | 0 | 5,348 |
| non-credit enhanced | 44 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 140 |
| | 14 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 96 | 65 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 227 |
| Winter 2016 | 682 | 1,438 | 172 | 252 | 796 | 442 | 757 | 723 | 453 | 0 | 5,716 |
| credit | 4,963 | 9,374 | 2,887 | 2,697 | 6,195 | 1,942 | 5,369 | 5,018 | 3,119 | 132 | 41,698 |
| non-credit enhanced | 119 | 169 | 27 | 32 | 138 | 59 | 82 | 31 | 103 | 0 | 759 |
| | 263 | 185 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 252 | 282 | 294 | 56 | 0 | 1,444 |
| Spring 2016 | 5,346 | 9,728 | 2,914 | 2,841 | 6,333 | 2,253 | 5,382 | 5,694 | 3,278 | 132 | 43,901 |
| credit | 866 | 323 | 277 | 189 | 227 | 298 | 727 | 755 | 573 | 59 | 4,293 |
| non-credit enhanced | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 69 |
| Summer 2016/1 | 912 | 338 | 277 | 189 | 227 | 298 | 764 | 755 | 578 | 59 | 4,397 |
| Total 2015-16 | 13,151 | 24,667 | 7,009 | 6,656 | 15,574 | 5,703 | 13,343 | 13,424 | 7,740 | 334 | 107,601 |
| Total Credit | 12,124 | 23,137 | 6,946 | 6,353 | 15,238 | 5,038 | 12,305 | 12,640 | 7,349 | 334 | 101,464 |
| Total Non-Cr Regular | 426 | 453 | 63 | 129 | 336 | 111 | 183 | 66 | 266 | 0 | 2,034 |
| Total Non-Cr Enhanced | 601 | 1,077 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 554 | 855 | 717 | 125 | 0 | 4,103 |

| | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade-Tech | Valley | West | ITV | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| credit | 1,297 | 21,517 | 692 | 6,096 | 14,751 | 4,872 | 12,001 | 10,897 | 6,932 | 444 | 99,791 |
| non-credit enhanced | 141 | 561 | 63 | 118 | 318 | 84 | 242 | 74 | 246 | 0 | 2,148 |
| | 472 | 1,530 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,148 |
| Non-Credit Reg | 472 | 1,530 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,148 |
| Non-Credit Enhanced | 520 | 791 | 0 | 462 | 206 | 462 | 206 | 462 | 3 | 0 | 2,148 |
| Total | 13,388 | 24,900 | 6,986 | 6,400 | 15,114 | 5,423 | 13,509 | 13,461 | 7,229 | 444 | 104,353 |
| % Pctch of Base | 94.7% | 107.7% | 100.3% | 104.0% | 105.1% | 105.1% | 105.7% | 99.7% | 107.1% | 75.2% | 103.2% |

2015-16 [updated] BASE FTES (as of 2014-15 RECALC)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Credit | 12,540 | 21,832 | 6,668 | 6,149 | 14,901 | 4,878 | 11,988 | 12,565 | 7,000 | 422 | 98,944 |
| Non-Credit Reg | 426 | 646 | 71 | 125 | 331 | 74 | 126 | 70 | 282 | 0 | 2,150 |
| Non-Credit Enhanced | 485 | 784 | 0 | 179 | 476 | 539 | 703 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 3,176 |
| Total adj Funded 2015-15 | 13,451 | 23,262 | 6,739 | 6,453 | 15,232 | 5,428 | 12,653 | 13,338 | 7,291 | 422 | 104,269 |
| % Pctch of Base | 97.8% | 106.0% | 104.0% | 103.1% | 102.2% | 105.1% | 105.5% | 100.6% | 106.2% | 79.0% | 103.2% |

2015-16 P2 Report

Apportionment FTES

| | City | East | Harbor | Mission | Pierce | Southwest | Trade-Tech | Valley | West | ITV | Total |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------|------------------|
| Total 2015-16 | 13,388 | 24,357 | 7,005 | 6,647 | 15,570 | 5,701 | 13,259 | 13,416 | 7,700 | 353 | 107,400.9 |
| Total Credit | 12,439 | 22,925 | 6,936 | 6,323 | 15,232 | 5,015 | 12,229 | 12,609 | 7,290 | 353 | 101,341 |
| Total Non-Cr Regular | 385 | 484 | 73 | 129 | 336 | 100 | 188 | 61 | 280 | 0 | 1,989 |
| Total Non-Cr Enhanced | 574 | 978 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 585 | 542 | 746 | 150 | 0 | 4,070 |

Diff between Anl & P2 (237.53) 310.20 0.74 9.07 3.68 1.92 83.77 7.92 39.63 (19.16) 200.24

7/27/2016

Tentative Initial Target

| College | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 Tentative Initial Targets | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| | FTES Actual | FTES Target | % Growth |
| City | 13,151 | 13,414 | 2.0% |
| East | 24,667 | 25,160 | 2.0% |
| Harbor | 7,009 | 7,148 | 2.0% |
| Mission | 6,656 | 6,846 | 2.9% |
| Pierce | 15,574 | 15,881 | 2.0% |
| Southwest | 5,703 | 5,815 | 2.0% |
| Trade | 13,343 | 13,750 | 3.1% |
| Valley | 13,424 | 13,692 | 2.0% |
| West | 7,740 | 8,162 | 5.5% |
| ITV | 334 | 364 | 9.0% |
| District | 107,601 | 110,233 | 2.4% |

Los Angeles Community College District
District Budget Committee

2016-2017
Final Budget Development

July 27, 2016

2016-17 Final Budget Development

- 2015-16 Preliminary Ending Balance (Pending Closing)
- 2016-17 State Signed Budget
- 2016-17 Budget Trailer Bill Summary

Budget Planning Priorities

- Set Enrollment Growth Target for FY 2016-17 = (2% funded growth)
- Meet FON Obligation for Fall 2016
- Address Increases in STRS and PERS Contribution
- Plan Proposition 30 Temporary Tax Expires
- Ensure funding is provided for facilities
maintenance, instructional Support and other operation needs
- Maintain a minimum of 10% reserves

Impact on LACCD Based on Governor's Signed Budget

Unrestricted General Fund (for General Operations):

- No COLA
- Funded Growth Revenue (2%) \$10.7 million
- \$6.8 million increase in base allocation funding for support of district general operating expenses

Restricted General Fund:

- \$2.1 million for Basic Skills
- \$4.5 million for energy efficiency projects (Prop 39)
- \$16.9 million in Scheduled Maintenance & Instructional Equip

Other State Funded Funds:

- 9.7 million in state mandate block grant for outstanding mandate claims, facilities, scheduled maintenance, instructional supports, and other district obligations (?)

Proposed Changes for Final Budget

Additional Resources

- FY 2015-16 Open Orders and Balances
- Adjustments to Growth (2%)
- Proposed to distribute \$6.8 million increase to Base

Additional Expenditures

- \$8 million for SIS Project Completion
- \$1.1 million for District Wellness

Supplemental Information





2016-17 BUDGET TRAILER BILL SUMMARY

The Budget Trailer Bill Language is the implementing statute needed to effectuate the proposals in the annual Budget Bill. For community colleges, the 2016-17 budget agreement provides just over \$500 million in new ongoing Proposition 98 resources, and approximately \$350 million in one-time funds. This year, the community college Trailer Bill proposal includes policy implementation details and requirements for:

- The Strong Workforce Program (Page 1)
- The Student Success for Basic Skills Program (Page 5)
- The Zero-Textbook-Cost Associate Degree Grant Program (Page 7)
- The Awards for Innovation in Higher Education (Page 8)
- The Adult Education Block Grant (Page 8)
- California Promise Programs (Page 9)
- Amendments to Community Supported Districts Full-Time Faculty Funding (Page 9)

Strong Workforce Program - Trailer Bill Language:

SUMMARY: The Governor's 2016-17 budget proposes \$200 million for the Strong Workforce Program. The Trailer Bill language statutorily establishes the program under §88820 Part 54.5 of the Education Code to expand the availability of quality community college CTE and workforce development programs. The program uses the existing regional CTE structure for the planning and development of new or expanded programs and it would use that regional structure to distribute funds to colleges.

The Strong Workforce Program would comply with the California Strategic Workforce Development Plan required by the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). The final proposal clarifies that the regional structure is based on the seven Doing What Matters regions.

Analysis:

The Strong Workforce proposal is one of the largest augmentation in the 2016-17 budget – the robust investment makes it important to establish a program construct that works for practitioners on the ground. The new Strong Workforce Program establishes a regional funding and planning model in order to expand CTE offerings statewide. The principles outlined for the distribution of funds focus on expanded or new quality programs. The final Strong Workforce Program allocation methodology provide colleges with a base level of funding to address some ongoing costs of existing CTE programs. The language indicates that 60% of the funding will go directly to colleges and 40% will go to regional consortia. The language also requires consortia to collaborate with regional workforce partners, report on one-time versus ongoing spending, and encourages consortia to work with programs and providers that seek to improve workforce outcomes for the developmentally disabled. The final agreement maintains the originally proposed formula which allocates

funding based on a formula that includes local unemployment rate, the region's proportion of CTE full-time equivalent students, projected job openings, and proportion of successful workforce outcomes. Lastly, the new Strong Workforce Program moves to a performance accountability model in the 2017-18 fiscal year.

Structure Proposed for the Strong Workforce Program:

- Sets up a regional structure for planning of CTE programs and delivery of funds.
- No later than June 30, 2017, the Chancellor's Office shall present to the Board of Governors policies, regulations and guidance necessary to implement the Strong Workforce Program. Plan shall:
 1. Include regional development, implementation and sharing of effective practices, curriculum models and courses.
 2. Enable districts to develop CTE workforce outcome and CTE associate degrees for transfer.
 3. Provide performance and labor market data to help align programming with regional labor market needs.
 4. Encourage local efficiency through regional partnerships.
 5. Enable students to transfer college-level CTE credits across college districts, CSU and UC.
 6. Improve sector-based engagement with employers within a region.
 7. Provide work-based learning opportunities.
 8. Enable college districts to optimize their resources.
 9. Ensure expenditures are focused on improving workforce outcomes.
 10. By July 1, 2017, develop a plan to streamline the process for course and curriculum approval.
 11. Reevaluate the minimum qualifications for CTE instructors.
- The Chancellor's Office shall review plans every four-years and determine if each regional collaborative has made significant progress in meeting goals, and provide technical assistance to collaboratives that have not.
- The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges shall establish a CTE subcommittee with no less than 70% of subcommittee members consisting of CTE faculty.

District-To-Region Split:

- Forty percent (40%) of funds appropriated shall go directly to the fiscal agent of the consortium to fund regionally prioritized projects and programs.
- Sixty percent (60%) of funds appropriated shall go directly to community college districts in the consortium.
 - As a condition of receiving direct funding, each district shall be an active consortium participant.

Conditions for Receiving Funds:

- Be member of a CTE regional consortium.
- Identify a regional fiscal agent.
- Identify and agree to a regional governance model.

- Participants can include K-12, CSU and workforce partners.
- Only community colleges can determine the governance model.
- Provide an analysis of regional labor market needs, an inventory of regional priorities, and programs and goals.
- Provide a work plan, a spending plan and budget for regionally prioritized projects.
 - Work plans are due every 4 years.
 - Update may be submitted annually.
- Funds appropriated shall supplement, not supplant.
- CTE regional consortia shall allocate funds only to college districts.

Receiving Funds In 2016-17:

- Chancellor’s Office will consider the following for allocation of 2016-17 funds:
 - 1. Local unemployment rates**
 - 2. Proportion of CTE FTES**
 - 3. Proportion of projected job openings.**
- Up to 5% to a college district for statewide activities and program administration.
- By August 30, 2016, the Chancellor’s Office shall recommend the allocation of funds to CTE regional consortia.

Receiving Funds After July 1, 2017:

Funding Formula to Consortia -

- The Chancellor’s Office shall recommend allocation of funds (40%) to CTE regional consortia based on the following weight factors:
 1. Unemployment rate (33%)
 2. Portion of CTE FTES (33%)
 3. Portion of projected job opening (17%)
 4. Portion of successful workforce outcomes as evidenced by WIOA performance accountability measures (17%)

Funding Formula to Districts -

- The Chancellor’s Office shall recommend allocation of funds to districts based on the following weight factors:
 1. Unemployment rate (33%)
 2. Portion of CTE FTES (33%)
 3. Portion of projected job opening (17%)
 4. Portion of successful workforce outcomes as evidenced by WIOA performance accountability measures (17%)
- Regional collaboratives shall have an approved plan that includes:
 - An identified fiscal agent
 - An identified governance model
 - Analysis of regional labor market needs including wage data
 - Regionally prioritized projects
 - Measurable regional goals aligned to WIOA
 - Description of alignment with other regional work plans and spending plans
- Plans shall be approved regionally every four years by January 31.

- Plans should avoid duplication.
- College districts shall meet at least annually with their regional collaborative
- College districts should utilize regional plans to inform campus-level planning

Federal WIOA Performance Accountability Measures:

The language also calls for alignment with the federal WIOA Performance Accountability Measures which consist of the following:

1. Percentage of participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program;
2. Percentage of participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after exit from the program;
3. Median earnings of participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program;
4. Percentage of participants who obtain a credential, diploma or GED during participation in or within 1 year after exit from the program;
5. Percentage of participants who, during a program year, are in an education that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable skill gains toward such a credential or employment; and
6. Indicators of effectiveness in serving employers.

Student Success for Basic Skills Program – Trailer Bill Language:

SUMMARY: The Trailer Bill rewrites the current Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) and proposes to establish the Student Success for Basic Skills Program, adding §88815 Part 54.3 to the Education Code, to improve the number of students successfully completing basic skills course sequences and transitioning to college-level math and English coursework. The program sets minimum conditions in order for colleges to access new basic skills funds. These minimum conditions include: 1) resubmitting a basic skills plan, and 2) implementing multiple measures.

This language augments funding for basic skills by \$30 million, bringing the total funding for the Student Success for Basic Skills program to \$50 million. The program allocates up to 5% to a selected college district for the administration of faculty and staff development to improve curriculum, instruction, and student services in English as a second language (ESL) and basic skills. Funds are designed to be released as grants to districts. While the program does not establish a competitive grant process, it does outline specific qualifying criteria and some performance metrics for the funds. Under this proposal, college districts' basic skills funding would be held harmless at 2015-16 levels, meaning colleges will not receive less funding than they received under the (current) the BSI and would be eligible for additional dollars if they meet the parameters of the bill.

Analysis:

The new Student Success of Basic Skills Program essentially reconfigures the distribution of Basic Skills dollars in an attempt to incentivize improved outcomes and performance. Through the redesign of this program, the Administration and Legislature are hoping to move colleges towards the practices emphasized in the Basic Skills Transformation program (§88800 of the Education Code). The new program plans to rank colleges based on their outcomes in order to identify which colleges can benefit from technical assistance.

The proposal allocates fifty percent (50%) of the funds to districts based on performance outcome measures and incentivizes researched practices that more effectively place students in courses, accelerates completion, and promotes curriculum redesign.

Use of Funds:

Funding can be used for a variety of purposes, including:

- Program and curriculum planning and development
- Student assessment
- Advisement and counseling services
- Tutoring
- Articulation
- Instructional equipment and materials
- Implementation or expansion of practices identified in the Basic Skills Transformation Program of 2015.

Eligibility Criteria:

A college district must:

1. Complete a revised assessment of programs and activities serving basic skills and ESL students
2. Submit to the Chancellor's Office an action and expenditure plan
3. Establish multiple measures for assessment and placement
4. Priority will be given to districts that implement or expand evidence-based practices and principles included in the Basic Skills Transformation* program in the 2015 Budget Act (see list below).

Funding Allocation:

The Chancellor's Office shall allocate funds to districts that meet the application criteria based on the following factors:

- Fifty percent (50%) based on the percent of students receiving a BOG Fee Waiver who first enroll in a course below transfer level English or math or ESL and complete a college-level course within one year and within two years.
- Twenty-five percent (25%) based on percentage of students receiving a BOG Fee waiver.
- Twenty-five percent (25%) based on percentage of basic skills FTES in courses offered by district using evidence-based practices*.

Other:

- Minimum allocation of \$100,000 per college
- Five lowest-performing districts will be encouraged to apply for technical assistance

***Basic Skills Transformation (Budget Act of 2015) – Qualifying Criteria (§88810):**

The 2016-17 Budget Trailer Bill language references these criteria in order to qualify for new basic skills funds.

Expand the use or application of, two or more of the following evidence-based practices:

1. Adopting placement tests that include multiple measures of student performance.
2. Increasing the placements into gateway English and mathematics courses that are transferable to UC or CSU and CTE pathways, with remedial instruction integrated.
3. Aligning content in remedial courses with programs of study.
4. Contextualizing remedial instruction.
5. Providing student support services that are integrated with instruction.
6. Developing two-and three-course sequences for completion of a college-level English or mathematics course, or both, for underprepared students, by either utilizing technology or other effective basic skills course practices.

Zero-Textbook-Cost Associate Degree Grant Program – Trailer Bill Language:

SUMMARY: The Trailer Bill adds Article 4 (§78050) to the Education Code, the Zero-Textbook-Cost Associate Degree Grant Program, to reduce the overall cost of education for students. A “zero-textbook-cost degree” is defined as an associate’s degree or CTE certificate that can be earned without conventional textbook costs. The program will distribute grants of up to \$200,000 for each zero-textbook-cost degree (Z-degree) it develops. The Chancellor may distribute both planning and implementation grants. This language implements the allocation of \$5 million in one-time grants.

Analysis:

Textbooks have become one of community college students’ highest educational expenses. Since the development of Z-degrees will be an extensive process, there is a two-year period of fund availability for this program. The Academic Senate of California Community Colleges has been engaged in this effort and will encourage colleges to work collaboratively with their local academic senates in the development of these degrees. The focus on increasing college affordability is consistent with League policy priorities.

Definition of Zero-Textbook-Cost Degrees:

- An associate degrees or CTE certificates earned by completing courses that eliminate textbook costs by using alternative instructional materials and methods, including open educational resources (OER).
- Student printing of instructional materials is not considered a program cost.

Conditions for Receiving Funds:

1. Develop and implement a Z-degree from an existing associate degree for transfer (ADT) or existing CTE certificate, or develop a certificate with high market.
2. Give priority to developing Z-degrees from existing degrees for transfer.
3. Consider sustainability after grant, including how content is updated.
4. Comply with Federal ADA requirements.
5. Develop a minimum of one degree per grant.
6. Make degrees developed accessible for use by other colleges through online clearinghouse or California Digital Open Source Library.
7. Ensure faculty have flexibility to update and customize degree content.
8. Ensure that Z-degrees are clearly identified in college catalogs and course schedules.
9. Provide the Chancellor’s Office with planning and outcome information.
10. Consult with the college’s academic senate.
11. Include faculty, administrators, librarians, and other content-focused staff.
12. Strive to implement the first degree by 2018-19 academic year.

Up to 10% of the funds allocated in the Budget Act of 2016 for this program can be allocated to a college for administration of the program. By June 30, 2019, the Chancellor’s Office shall report to the Legislature and DOF on: 1) the number of degrees developed, 2) the estimated annual savings by students, 3) the number of students who completed Z-degrees, and 4) recommendations to increase or improve the program. Funds not awarded in 2016-17 may be awarded in 2017-18.

Awards for Innovation in Higher Education – Trailer Bill Language:

The Trailer Bill adds Article 2.6 (§6010.96) to the Education Code, establishing the Awards for Innovation in Higher Education program. The program establishes a Committee on Awards for Innovation in Higher Education consisting of 7 members, include the Director of Finance, an appointee of the Speaker of the Assembly, an appointee of the Senate Rules Committee and four appointees of the Governor. The program uses \$25 million in one-time funds.

Awards Purpose:

Funds shall be awarded for innovations that reduce time-to-degree or credentials and/or reduce the total cost of attendance.

Award Categories:

1. Redesign of curriculum and instruction, such as three-year degrees.
2. Programs that allow students to make progress toward completion based on demonstrated knowledge and competencies, including military training and prior learning.
3. Programs that make financial aid more accessible, including increasing the number of students who apply for financial aid or reduce the cost of books and supplies.

Analysis:

This is the third year the Department of Finance has proposed the Awards for Innovation; however, instead of structuring the program as a prize for a college's existing efforts, this year the awards are structured as incentives to advance educational practices that increase access and save students time and money. The proposed structure may provide colleges with start-up resources for practices. The program does not have to be implemented at the time of application.

Adult Education Trailer Bill Amendment:

The Trailer Bill amends §84905 of the Education Code, the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG). The amendments states that each consortium shall consider the input of students, school district teachers, community college faculty, principals, administrators, classified staff and the local bargaining units of the school districts and community college districts before it makes a decision.

Analysis:

This amendment addresses concerns posed by organizations representing faculty and classified staff that their input was not considered when approving AEBG regional consortia plans. This amendment prevented the introduction of a bill sponsored by CSEA to specifically including classified staff in consortia planning. The amendment respects local control and does not prescribe how input should be considered.

California Promise Programs Bill Language:

SUMMARY: The Budget Bill adds funding for California College Promise Grants, contingent on the passage of Assembly Bill 1741 (Rodriguez), which would add §88900, Part 54.1 to Division 7 of Title 3 if the Education Code.

Grant Application Conditions:

In order to receive a grant, the community college district shall demonstrate they will partner with one or more school districts and one or more California State University or University of California campuses to establish a California College Promise program that includes all of the following practices:

1. Partner with one or more school districts to establish an Early Commitment to College Program pursuant to Article 6.3 (commencing with Section 54710) of Chapter 9 of Part 29 of Division 4 of Title 2 to provide students and families assistance opportunities to learn about college, including college preparatory courses and financial aid.
2. Partner with one or more school districts to improve high school student preparation for college through practices such as small learning communities and concurrent enrollment.
3. Utilize placement and student assessment indicators that include multiple measures of student performance.
4. Provide students with access to full-time course schedules that include math, reading, and English courses.
5. Provide outreach to students regarding the Associate Degrees for Transfer and the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Cal Grant program and other transfer pathways.
6. Partner with regional California State University campuses, if enrollment is not impacted, with the goal of guaranteed admission and seamless transfer for students who have successfully completed transfer requirements.

Use of Funds:

Grants may be used for professional development, learning communities between K-12 and community colleges, outreach and marketing to increase college-going rates, curriculum development, and other practices that promote college attendance and persistence.

Full-Time Faculty Trailer Bill Amendment:

The Trailer Bill amends Item 6870-101-0001 Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2015 to allow Community Supported Districts to receive funds allocated for full-time faculty hiring. The Budget Act of 2015 allocated \$62.2 million under Schedule (1) for these purposes.

Language:

“All districts including districts that have offsetting local revenues that exceed the funding calculated pursuant to the district’s budget formula, shall receive funding pursuant to this subdivision.”