



**District Planning Committee
February 23, 2018 Minutes
Educational Service Center, Board Hearing Room**

Attendance:

Badalyan, Anna	City	Kudo, Mily	ESC
Boateng, Agyeman	West	Master, Sarah	Mission
Cornner, Ryan	ESC	Pearl, Maury	ESC
Diaz, Martin	Trade-Tech	Stewart, Robert	Southwest
Echeverri, Angela	DAS	Wardinski, Steve	East
Gallegos, Alfred	Southwest		

The minutes of the January 26, 2018 meetings were reviewed and approved.

Update on New State Budget Model

Ryan provided an overview of the new state budget model. The model includes both performance and equity-based funding component (similar to the K-12 local control formula). In the current model, funding is primarily enrollment (FTES) driven. In the new model, 50% of funding is based on enrollment (FTES). The enrollment driven component is termed the Base Grant and is calculated as $45.2\% \times \text{FTES} \times \text{Reimbursement Rate per FTES}$. A second component of the new model, accounting for 25% of funding, is termed the Supplemental Grant. This component is based on the number of students receiving BOG and Pell grants. It is computed as the number of students receiving the BOG (recently renamed the California Promise Grant) $\times \$1,272$ and the number of students receiving Pell Grant $\times \$2,029$. Student receiving both BOG and Pell are double counted. The final component of the model, accounting for the remaining 25% of funding, is termed the Success Grant and is based on three factors: total annual award count (not unduplicated for each student), the number of completions within a three-year period, and the annual number of Associate Degrees for Transfer. The revenue computational formulas for the success components are: Total Awards $\times \$5,275$; Three-year completions $\times \$6,097$; and ADTs $\times \$3,931$. An additional provision of the new model is that during the first year of implementation districts would be held harmless to 2017-18 funding levels. Ryan noted that the new model could significantly alter enrollment management practices since both efficiency and success criteria are included in the new model. This could mean funding classes that have lower efficiency (enrollment), provided that they contribute to student attainment of degrees or certificates. At the state level, chief business officers (CBO) and chief executive officers workgroups (CEO) are discussing the new model and collecting feedback. [The LACCD is represented by Jeanette Gordon (Treasurer/CFO) on the CBO group and ELAC President Marvin Martinez on the CEO group.] Ryan commented that the Department of Finance (DOF) had developed simulations of the new model, but these were based on questionable interpretations of the trailer bill language and data measures that appear to disadvantage the LACCD. For example, the trailer bill describes the Pell component as being based on simple count of Pell awards whereas the simulation applied a unit threshold for including Pell grants in the count. Also, awards were based on the Scorecard completion data. The completion rate cohort requires that students attempt Math or English, which would negatively impact award counts derived from the Scorecard data since these courses in these subjects are not required for certificate completion. The trailer bill also specifies that only state approved awards be counted, but also includes non-credit certificates which advantages districts (San Diego) that have received state approval for and award large number of these certificates.

Implementation of DSP Priorities

Ryan reviewed the DSP priorities and proposed a framework for assigning them within the District and the committee made the following recommendations:

- Goal 5, Objective 5 (we will improve the resource allocation processes to be integrated with District Strategic Plan) will be assigned to the DBC. Ryan will be working on helping to develop a revised District Budget allocation model.
- Goal 5, Objective 4 (we will effectively use District and College resources and implement position control to support the ongoing improvements of academic and student support programs)
 - 1) Position control will be assigned to District IT and Finance, since both areas would have responsibility for implementing this system.
 - 2) Effective utilization of resources was assigned to the colleges, since colleges develop and implement their own strategies for effective resource use. District is assigned the responsibility of identifying and analyzing best practices in this area.
- Goal 5, Objective 6 (we will effectively plan and use resources to build and maintain District and College facilities and infrastructure in support of the academic and student support programs) was seen as primarily a District-level responsibility. District Facilities, through the Board's FMPOC, will be assigned the role of developing bond-funded and other projects for improving District facilities.
- Goal 3, Objective 1 (we will decrease time to completion by enhancing academic and student support programs) and Objective 2 (we will increase completion of degrees and certificates) involve both college and District strategies. Multiple district roles were identified for this objective including:
 - 1) developing a process to automate awarding of degrees and certificates using degree audit functionality in the PeopleSoft SIS
 - 2) developing a process or queries for identifying students enrolled in capstone classes or those close to completion
 - 3) developing a system or model for identifying courses needed by students to complete their educational plan
 - 4) identifying best practices for advancing degree completion
- The District role for Goal 2, Objective 6 (we will increase access to higher education by assisting students in gaining access to financial aid and ensuring that all students, whether in-person or online, receive orientation, multiple measures assessment, and educational planning) was identified and included the following:
 - 1) identify the target date for financial aid disbursements
 - 2) improve communications to college and students, including developing materials for district-wide distribution and ensuring consistent/standard language for materials provide in student orientation and college catalogs
 - 3) develop a communications plan for notifying students about important information and deadlines
 - 4) promote AB705 compliance by developing a template or ranking tool to help colleges determine placement levels

Coordination of College and District Strategic Plans

Ryan state that the initial step in the process of coordinating college and District strategic plans would be to ask colleges for strategies that they have identified. It was agreed that the focus would be on strategies for the prioritized items. There was also discussion of the use of planning software (e.g.,Taskstream) to help manage the DSP implementation process. Finally, Ryan also mentioned that the District Accreditation Committee (DAC) would be meeting soon to develop a timeline for submission of mid-term reports and that joint meetings between DPC and DAC (once or twice per year) would be planned.

Next Meeting:

Friday, March 23, 2018, 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.
7th Floor Conference Room, ESC