California Community Colleges—Review of Performance Funding

Project Parameters

1. Unit of Analysis is District, not campus
2. Project deals only with performance component of the funding model—not access and equity components
3. Will include analysis of individual components
   a. Stability/variability over time
   b. Impact of different weighting schemes
   c. Impact of different time periods—three year, five year averages, etc.
   d. Elimination of projected data—using actual data only.
4. Will allow investigation of alternative constructs, e.g.
   a. Adding weights for different subpopulations
   b. Using alternative metrics for some concepts
   c. Adding metrics (e.g., a metric for credentials awarded in high-priority fields)
5. For each alternative investigated, the redistribution effects will be calculated—which districts lose funds, which gain and how much in both instances.

Project Activities

In order to achieve the objectives of the project, NCHEMS staff will undertake the following activities:

1. Early in the project, meet with the Task Force that is overseeing the review for purposes of:
   a. Ensuring agreement on the parameters and timeline for the project
   b. Identifying specific concerns with the existing model—identifying "sticking point" from the districts' perspectives
   c. Review the specifics of the model as it exists
   d. Discussing alternative formulations, possible modifications to be investigated.
2. Support Community College League of California's effort to acquire necessary data
   a. Prepare initial data request
   b. Meet with CCCCO staff
      i. Discuss issues of data integrity—which variables are of questionable quality.

        ii. Discuss acquisition of data for alternative formulations/additional variables that might be investigated.

3. Build a data base (preferably 10 years of data) containing the data that will be utilized in the analyses and modeling efforts
4. Analyze individual components
   a. Are they stable or highly variable from year to year?
   b. Are there high levels of correlation between certain variables?
   c. Etc.
5. Create a model that allows investigation
   a. Inclusion of fewer (or different) metrics
   b. Assigning different weights to the metrics
   c. Adding a feature that creates "bonus" weights for high priority subpopulations—underrepresented minorities, Pell recipients, adults, etc.
   d. Using changes in variables over time instead of the absolute numbers
   e. The outputs will be data about extent of redistribution from current model
6. Meet with Task Force to:
   a. Review findings and results of analyses performed
   b. Conduct "on-the-fly" investigation of alternatives suggested by Task Force member. The model will be created so as to allow interaction/easy changing of variables, weights, etc.
   c. Identification of any additional work required