



## Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Funding Formula

**Friday, December 20, 2019**

3:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Meeting Notes

**Attendees:** *In person:* **Barbara Lezon**, Ed Services, Chancellor's Office; **Michael Quiaoit**, Ed Services, Chancellor's Office; **Francis Parmelee**, Finance and Facilities Planning, Chancellor's Office; **Thomas Ponik**, Ed Services, Chancellor's Office;

*Via Zoom:* **Sabrina Sencil**, Institutional Effectiveness, Cosumnes River College; **Amparo Diaz**, Success Center, Foundation for CCC; **Rachel Berliner**, Success Center, Foundation for CCC; **John Hetts**, Research/Ed Services, Chancellor's Office; **Georgina Guy**, Dean, Student Equity and Special Programs, Saddleback College; **Madelyn Arballo**, Continuing Education, Mt. San Antonio College; **Kimberly McDaniel**, Vice President, Student Services and Enrollment Management, Sacramento City College; **Brady Reed**, Student Services, Lassen College; **Clinton Slaughter**, Dean of Student Services, Butte College; **Eric Nelson**, Ed Services, Chancellor's Office

**Workgroup goal is to develop a Student Equity and Achievement Program Funding Formula to be in place for the 2021-22 year.**

The policy language states that each college's allocation has a hold harmless provision based on a 17-18 allocation. This formula would apply to any new dollars above these allocations.

What's driving the intent? In the past year, the group has been suggesting many different data elements but overall the guiding principles that aligned to the bill intent weren't ever established clearly enough. This was an attempt to re-focus the group on the bill's intent (decrease the achievement gap for underrepresented, high need students).

From here, we're supposed to now align the intent with data elements.

**Meeting goals – to come to group consensus on the intent of the SEA Funding Formula, and on the overarching components of the formula.**

### Formula Intent-

Each attendee was able to share what he/she sees as the intent of the funding formula. After hearing all attendees and discussing, the group agreed on the following:

The intent of the Student Equity and Achievement Program funding formula is:

1. to supplement (not copy) the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF), by focusing on student populations not identified in the SCFF, that are in most need of support, **(in addition to those who are included)**
2. to influence behaviors and activities on campuses that lead to improved student success outcomes,
3. and to incentivize colleges meeting their student equity goals.

### Formula Components-

Before data elements could be considered, the group discussed what overarching components would support the intent of the formula. After discussion, the group agreed on the following:

The major components of the Student Equity and Achievement Program funding formula should include:

1. Stability – minimize drastic year-to-year changes in allocation **(using a funding year that is prior may help)**
2. Simplicity – ability for colleges to replicate the formula; minimize confusion
3. Predictability – use data that colleges have access to well-ahead of time
4. Equity – student population measurements and student success supports
5. Need/Disadvantage – ensure that colleges with larger high-need populations receive adequate funding

#### Details from the discussion are below:

##### Intent:

- This formula should not copy the SCFF – but should support/supplement it.
- It should influence behaviors that are not captured in the SCFF – motivate colleges to do the work. Equity, educational planning, etc. Reinforce educational planning leading to success.
- The formula should aim to help those student outside of the SCFF **(noncredit, those whose outcomes are not measured by the success data, those who don't qualify for FA)**
- Still need to keep in mind the non-traditional students and their goals.
- The focus of the formula should be well-defined, not overly broad. Too broad and it loses its impact to ensure colleges focus on the student groups that need the support.
- The formula should help ensure that support services are going to the student groups who most need it.
- Formula should still be relatively simple and predictable.
- It should incentivize colleges to meet with equity goals.
- Should the formula reward good outcomes?? Or give extra funds to colleges who need it (may not be having good outcomes yet but have large populations of students in need)?
  - Group agreed that the latter was more appropriate, because the SCFF already includes success outcomes metrics as part of its funding.

##### Components:

- What are the CO's priorities? This will help inform the components.
- Group discussed the prior SSSP and Student Equity formulas: head count, breakdown of services - # counseling, ed plans, assessments, orientations, etc. We do not want this formula to be a count of widgets!
- For non-credit in the SSSP formula, the weight of headcount was increased to compensate for the other metrics that did not apply to non-credit. Would like a similar consideration in this new formula.
- A stable, predictable formula that does not bounce allocations up and down each year.
- A simple formula that a college is able to replicate on its own campus.
- Discussion about educational planning – its importance to this program and to student success. But also tutoring and academic supports as well as orientation and counseling.
- These are all student success supports that we know work and should be encouraged – but we do not want to count widgets.
  - Suggestion that there are other ways to measure – EX: determine what percentage of students on campus have a comp ed plan (instead of a count).
- What about student population groups? Can't fund based on a count of race population. But can do another way: EX: determine percentage of students at a campus with a GPA of less than 1.9. More services are required for those students- therefore more funding is needed.
- Per Ed Code 78221 the CO must prioritize funding based on high-need and disadvantaged student populations at colleges. These need to be included as a component.
  - Non-credit is not included in "high-need" due to how it is calculated. Use another metric – CA promise eligibility. **According to the CO staff, "high need" can be identified by data elements specific to credit students, generally related to financial aid. Not sure why CA promise is suggested to draw in noncredit student data since that's not applicable. Further, many colleges don't include NC students in their DI study. I have asked my NC colleagues about their own colleges and they aren't even aware if their NC students are part of the equity plan data.**

##### Additional Comments:

- For smaller colleges - Concern about losing funds based on headcount, especially if the transition to the formula is immediate and there is no cap on the change.
- Would like a transition period. And to build some stability into that period.
- Use prior, prior so colleges will know their allocation well ahead of time and can plan accordingly.

**Next Steps:**

- Group will share the discussion/consensus with their stakeholder groups and share any feedback.
- Barb will draft a one page document to share with CO executive team – including intent, components, and Ed Code revelations (constraints and parameters).
- Group will await executive approval before moving forward with formula development