

THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE SCFF: "...to encourage access for underrepresented students, and provide additional funding in recognition of the need to provide additional support for low-income students..."

FROM THE SCFF OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE'S DEFINITION OF EQUITY FOR STUDENTS: "Equity is a process of ensuring that all students are provided the resources and opportunities required to reach equivalent outcomes..."

If we really want to be honest, and serious, around Equity...

The Supplemental Allocation — as an Equity-Driven Model

The Supplemental Allocation can't claim to be Equity-driven as formulated, regardless of how it may have been named or advertised. It's essentially a "rob Peter to pay Paul" scheme that *re-distributes* 20% of system-wide apportionment (almost \$1.4 billion). The problem is structural: while it drives enhanced funding to districts serving higher proportions of financial aid students (a good thing), it systematically *cuts* funding to other districts (in some cases severely, often in high-cost regions) that also serve significant populations of low-income students. Fact is, about a third of the 1.5 million financial aid utilizations, recognized as drivers for enhanced funding statewide, occur in districts that face computational revenue *reductions* from the Supplemental Allocation. This is a recipe for unequal outcomes, and therefore requires redress.

TO MAKE THE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOCATION EQUITY-DRIVEN: The allocation needs to drive new resources for programs and services to support *all* low-income students in reaching equivalent outcomes, in a consistent way, *in every district*. Below is an illustration of how such an allocation could work; for every district, the model drives positive enhanced revenue in direct proportion to financial aid utilizations without forcing draconian cuts. It can easily be expanded to incorporate other metrics later. It continues to incentivize financial aid. The cost to phase it in over the hold harmless period is actually quite low.

NOTE: Baseline proportion of TCR is 20%. Proportions above 20% represent a funding gain; proportions below 20% represent a funding cut.

| | | (1) Supplemental Allocation From 2018-19 P2 | | | An Equity-driven approach to the Supplemental Allocation | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|---|---|-------------|---|
| Greater Bay Area districts highlighted | | funding per point >> | | | (2) per FTES | | (3) per POINT | | (4) | The larger of (1) and (4) |
| District | Region | 2017-18 TCR + 2.71% | Status Quo Supplemental Allocation | % of TCR ** | 2018-19 P2 CREDIT FTES 3-year Rolling Average | Pre-Patriated (Minimal) Funding from Credit FTES | Supplemental Allocation as additional funding | Revised Allocation for the 20% of Total Apportionment | % of TCR ** | An Alternate "Larger of the Two" Scheme |
| Allan Hancock | 6 | \$60,006,490 | \$11,414,899 | 19.0% | 8,166.84 | \$9,963,545 | \$1,863,150 | \$11,826,695 | 19.7% | \$11,826,695 |
| Antelope Valley | 6 | \$64,309,876 | \$20,626,036 | 32.1% | 10,348.45 | \$12,625,109 | \$3,366,600 | \$15,991,709 | 24.9% | \$20,626,036 |
| Barstow | 9 | \$19,187,728 | \$5,080,232 | 26.5% | 2,451.73 | \$2,991,111 | \$829,200 | \$3,820,311 | 19.9% | \$5,080,232 |
| Butte-Glenn | 1 | \$60,465,102 | \$12,593,057 | 20.8% | 8,833.05 | \$10,776,321 | \$2,055,450 | \$12,831,771 | 21.2% | \$12,831,771 |
| Cabrillo | 4 | \$62,721,594 | \$9,279,143 | 14.8% | 9,314.52 | \$11,363,714 | \$1,514,550 | \$12,878,264 | 20.5% | \$12,878,264 |
| Cerritos | 8 | \$95,980,074 | \$27,940,357 | 29.1% | 16,067.97 | \$19,602,923 | \$4,560,450 | \$24,163,373 | 25.2% | \$27,940,357 |
| Chabot-Las Positas | 4 | \$110,597,916 | \$15,350,057 | 13.9% | 16,164.79 | \$19,721,044 | \$2,505,450 | \$22,226,494 | 20.1% | \$22,226,494 |

| District | Region | 2017-18 TCR + 2.71% | 2018-19 Financial Aid Points | Status Quo Supplemental Allocation | % of TCR ** | 2018-19 P2 CREDIT FTES 3-year Rolling Average | Pre-Patriated (Minimal) Funding from Credit FTES | Supplemental Allocation as additional funding | Revised Allocation for the 20% of Total Apportionment | % of TCR ** | An Alternate "Larger of the Two" Scheme |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|---|--|---|---|-------------|---|
| Chaffey | 9 | \$96,208,271 | 27,273 | \$25,063,887 | 26.1% | 15,147.27 | \$18,479,669 | \$4,090,950 | \$22,570,619 | 23.5% | \$25,063,887 |
| Citrus | 8 | \$69,985,763 | 16,509 | \$15,171,771 | 21.7% | 11,170.94 | \$13,628,547 | \$2,476,350 | \$16,104,897 | 23.0% | \$16,104,897 |
| Coast | 8 | \$189,278,358 | 45,200 | \$41,538,800 | 21.9% | 30,691.56 | \$37,443,703 | \$6,780,000 | \$44,223,703 | 23.4% | \$44,223,703 |
| Compton | 7 | \$36,436,547 | 7,961 | \$7,316,159 | 20.1% | 5,442.10 | \$6,639,362 | \$1,194,150 | \$7,833,512 | 21.5% | \$7,833,512 |
| Contra Costa | 3 | \$174,860,154 | 29,771 | \$27,359,549 | 15.6% | 25,295.82 | \$30,860,900 | \$4,465,650 | \$35,326,550 | 20.2% | \$35,326,550 |
| Copper Mountain | 9 | \$13,261,478 | 3,101 | \$2,849,819 | 21.5% | 1,398.81 | \$1,706,548 | \$465,150 | \$2,171,698 | 16.4% | \$2,849,819 |
| Desert | 9 | \$60,227,485 | 15,558 | \$14,297,802 | 23.7% | 8,354.36 | \$10,192,319 | \$2,333,700 | \$12,526,019 | 20.8% | \$14,297,802 |
| El Camino | 7 | \$117,161,344 | 26,669 | \$24,508,811 | 20.9% | 18,276.47 | \$22,297,293 | \$4,000,350 | \$26,297,643 | 22.4% | \$26,297,643 |
| Feather River | 1 | \$13,999,898 | 1,641 | \$1,508,079 | 10.8% | 1,209.87 | \$1,476,041 | \$246,150 | \$1,722,191 | 12.3% | \$1,722,191 |
| Foothill-De Anza | 4 | \$151,922,001 | 21,988 | \$20,206,972 | 13.3% | 23,377.68 | \$28,520,770 | \$3,298,200 | \$31,818,970 | 20.9% | \$31,818,970 |
| Gavilan | 4 | \$33,146,984 | 5,156 | \$4,738,364 | 14.3% | 4,348.12 | \$5,304,706 | \$773,400 | \$6,078,106 | 18.3% | \$6,078,106 |
| Glendale | 7 | \$90,610,396 | 18,224 | \$16,747,856 | 18.5% | 11,268.84 | \$13,747,985 | \$2,733,600 | \$16,481,585 | 18.2% | \$16,747,856 |
| Grossmont-Cuyamac | 10 | \$112,352,905 | 28,434 | \$26,130,846 | 23.3% | 17,666.42 | \$21,553,032 | \$4,265,100 | \$25,818,132 | 23.0% | \$26,130,846 |
| Hartnell | 4 | \$44,303,668 | 11,510 | \$10,577,690 | 23.9% | 7,248.13 | \$8,842,719 | \$1,726,500 | \$10,569,219 | 23.9% | \$10,577,690 |
| Imperial | 10 | \$44,130,285 | 13,852 | \$12,729,988 | 28.8% | 6,988.76 | \$8,526,287 | \$2,077,800 | \$10,604,087 | 24.0% | \$12,729,988 |
| Kern | 5 | \$139,269,693 | 39,307 | \$36,123,133 | 25.9% | 20,862.26 | \$25,451,957 | \$5,896,050 | \$31,348,007 | 22.5% | \$36,123,133 |
| Lake Tahoe | 2 | \$14,700,532 | 2,714 | \$2,494,166 | 17.0% | 1,105.49 | \$1,348,698 | \$407,100 | \$1,755,798 | 11.9% | \$2,494,166 |
| Lassen | 1 | \$13,955,225 | 3,420 | \$3,142,980 | 22.5% | 796.54 | \$971,779 | \$513,000 | \$1,484,779 | 10.6% | \$3,142,980 |
| Long Beach | 8 | \$122,347,064 | 31,600 | \$29,040,400 | 23.7% | 19,125.85 | \$23,333,537 | \$4,740,000 | \$28,073,537 | 22.9% | \$29,040,400 |
| Los Angeles | 7 | \$622,259,976 | 153,749 | \$141,295,331 | 22.7% | 89,636.81 | \$109,356,908 | \$23,062,350 | \$132,419,258 | 21.3% | \$141,295,331 |
| Los Rios | 2 | \$312,197,311 | 77,245 | \$70,988,155 | 22.7% | 49,032.50 | \$59,819,650 | \$11,586,750 | \$71,406,400 | 22.9% | \$71,406,400 |
| Marin | 3 | \$26,300,883 | 3,434 | \$3,155,846 | 12.0% | 3,158.04 | \$3,852,809 | \$515,100 | \$4,367,909 | 16.6% | \$4,367,909 |
| Mendocino-Lake | 2 | \$23,042,131 | 4,367 | \$4,013,273 | 17.4% | 2,421.11 | \$2,953,754 | \$655,050 | \$3,608,804 | 15.7% | \$4,013,273 |
| Merced | 5 | \$58,027,464 | 14,552 | \$13,373,288 | 23.0% | 8,174.09 | \$9,972,390 | \$2,182,800 | \$12,155,190 | 20.9% | \$13,373,288 |
| Mira Costa | 10 | \$65,262,003 | 14,201 | \$13,050,719 | 20.0% | 9,799.67 | \$11,955,597 | \$2,130,150 | \$14,085,747 | 21.6% | \$14,085,747 |
| Monterey | 4 | \$39,942,761 | 6,683 | \$6,141,677 | 15.4% | 5,924.49 | \$7,227,878 | \$1,002,450 | \$8,230,328 | 20.6% | \$8,230,328 |
| Mt. San Antonio | 8 | \$181,205,395 | 38,305 | \$35,202,295 | 19.4% | 24,630.65 | \$30,049,393 | \$5,745,750 | \$35,795,143 | 19.8% | \$35,795,143 |
| Mt. San Jacinto | 9 | \$73,455,559 | 21,289 | \$19,564,591 | 26.6% | 11,052.30 | \$13,483,806 | \$3,193,350 | \$16,677,156 | 22.7% | \$19,564,591 |
| Napa Valley | 2 | \$32,477,200 | 5,648 | \$5,190,512 | 16.0% | 4,576.56 | \$5,583,403 | \$847,200 | \$6,430,603 | 19.8% | \$6,430,603 |
| North Orange Co. | 8 | \$207,531,995 | 39,338 | \$36,151,622 | 17.4% | 28,764.61 | \$35,092,824 | \$5,900,700 | \$40,993,524 | 19.8% | \$40,993,524 |
| Ohlone | 4 | \$50,085,990 | 5,501 | \$5,055,419 | 10.1% | 6,726.49 | \$8,206,318 | \$825,150 | \$9,031,468 | 18.0% | \$9,031,468 |
| Palomar | 10 | \$111,490,107 | 20,245 | \$18,605,155 | 16.7% | 17,204.78 | \$20,989,832 | \$3,036,750 | \$24,026,582 | 21.6% | \$24,026,582 |
| Palo Verde | 9 | \$17,087,631 | 3,554 | \$3,266,126 | 19.1% | 1,124.41 | \$1,371,780 | \$533,100 | \$1,904,880 | 11.1% | \$3,266,126 |
| Pasadena | 7 | \$138,108,474 | 30,969 | \$28,460,511 | 20.6% | 22,553.33 | \$27,515,063 | \$4,645,350 | \$32,160,413 | 23.3% | \$32,160,413 |
| Peralta | 3 | \$117,782,211 | 24,599 | \$22,606,481 | 19.2% | 16,312.03 | \$19,900,677 | \$3,689,850 | \$23,590,527 | 20.0% | \$23,590,527 |
| Rancho Santiago | 8 | \$169,318,347 | 27,520 | \$25,290,880 | 14.9% | 19,853.92 | \$24,221,782 | \$4,128,000 | \$28,349,782 | 16.7% | \$28,349,782 |
| Redwoods | 1 | \$27,626,532 | 5,862 | \$5,387,178 | 19.5% | 3,388.69 | \$4,134,202 | \$879,300 | \$5,013,502 | 18.1% | \$5,387,178 |
| Rio Hondo | 8 | \$76,496,508 | 17,899 | \$16,449,181 | 21.5% | 11,802.51 | \$14,399,062 | \$2,684,850 | \$17,083,912 | 22.3% | \$17,083,912 |
| Riverside | 9 | \$178,432,906 | 45,868 | \$42,152,692 | 23.6% | 29,114.55 | \$35,519,751 | \$6,880,200 | \$42,399,951 | 23.8% | \$42,399,951 |

| District | Region | 2017-18 TCR + 2.71% | 2018-19 Financial Aid Points | Status Quo Supplemental Allocation | % of TCR ** | 2018-19 P2 CREDIT FTES 3-year Rolling Average | Pre-Patriated (Minimal) Funding from Credit FTES | Supplemental Allocation as additional funding | Revised Allocation for the 20% of Total Apportionment | % of TCR ** | An Alternate "Larger of the Two" Scheme |
|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|--|--|----------------|---|
| San Bernardino | 9 | \$91,458,422 | 24,180 | \$22,221,420 | 24.3% | 14,519.96 | \$17,714,351 | \$3,627,000 | \$21,341,351 | 23.3% | \$22,221,420 |
| San Diego | 10 | \$252,718,089 | 48,985 | \$45,017,215 | 17.8% | 33,355.56 | \$40,693,783 | \$7,347,750 | \$48,041,533 | 19.0% | \$48,041,533 |
| San Francisco | 3 | \$131,835,157 | 17,497 | \$16,079,743 | 12.2% | 15,263.00 | \$18,620,860 | \$2,624,550 | \$21,245,410 | 16.1% | \$21,245,410 |
| San Joaquin Delta | 5 | \$92,726,643 | 22,967 | \$21,106,673 | 22.8% | 14,110.51 | \$17,214,822 | \$3,445,050 | \$20,659,872 | 22.3% | \$21,106,673 |
| San Jose-Evergreen | 4 | \$72,536,301 | 17,135 | \$15,747,065 | 21.7% | 11,414.19 | \$13,925,312 | \$2,570,250 | \$16,495,562 | 22.7% | \$16,495,562 |
| San Luis Obispo | 6 | \$50,399,559 | 8,298 | \$7,625,862 | 15.1% | 6,399.62 | \$7,807,536 | \$1,244,700 | \$9,052,236 | 18.0% | \$9,052,236 |
| San Mateo | 3 | \$100,953,254 | 16,016 | \$14,718,704 | 14.6% | 14,997.20 | \$18,296,584 | \$2,402,400 | \$20,698,984 | 20.5% | \$20,698,984 |
| Santa Barbara | 6 | \$74,578,260 | 14,018 | \$12,882,542 | 17.3% | 11,034.40 | \$13,461,968 | \$2,102,700 | \$15,564,668 | 20.9% | \$15,564,668 |
| Santa Clarita | 6 | \$97,008,145 | 15,778 | \$14,499,982 | 14.9% | 15,195.68 | \$18,538,730 | \$2,366,700 | \$20,905,430 | 21.6% | \$20,905,430 |
| Santa Monica | 7 | \$133,439,383 | 28,907 | \$26,565,533 | 19.9% | 19,660.36 | \$23,985,639 | \$4,336,050 | \$28,321,689 | 21.2% | \$28,321,689 |
| Sequoias | 5 | \$63,056,396 | 16,712 | \$15,358,328 | 24.4% | 9,096.71 | \$11,097,986 | \$2,506,800 | \$13,604,786 | 21.6% | \$15,358,328 |
| Shasta-Tehama-Trini | 1 | \$42,921,686 | 11,693 | \$10,745,867 | 25.0% | 5,963.53 | \$7,275,507 | \$1,753,950 | \$9,029,457 | 21.0% | \$10,745,867 |
| Sierra | 2 | \$88,915,754 | 18,115 | \$16,647,685 | 18.7% | 12,925.11 | \$15,768,634 | \$2,717,250 | \$18,485,884 | 20.8% | \$18,485,884 |
| Siskiyou | 1 | \$18,642,887 | 2,114 | \$1,942,766 | 10.4% | 1,630.23 | \$1,988,881 | \$317,100 | \$2,305,981 | 12.4% | \$2,305,981 |
| Solano | 2 | \$49,841,121 | 8,239 | \$7,571,641 | 15.2% | 6,394.87 | \$7,801,741 | \$1,235,850 | \$9,037,591 | 18.1% | \$9,037,591 |
| Sonoma | 3 | \$109,817,839 | 15,087 | \$13,864,953 | 12.6% | 14,875.12 | \$18,147,646 | \$2,263,050 | \$20,410,696 | 18.6% | \$20,410,696 |
| South Orange Co. | 8 | \$156,810,869 | 21,917 | \$20,141,723 | 12.8% | 23,291.52 | \$28,415,654 | \$3,287,550 | \$31,703,204 | 20.2% | \$31,703,204 |
| Southwestern | 10 | \$95,122,607 | 22,668 | \$20,831,892 | 21.9% | 14,155.18 | \$17,269,320 | \$3,400,200 | \$20,669,520 | 21.7% | \$20,831,892 |
| State Center | 5 | \$186,065,439 | 50,301 | \$46,226,619 | 24.8% | 27,944.08 | \$34,091,778 | \$7,545,150 | \$41,636,928 | 22.4% | \$46,226,619 |
| Ventura | 6 | \$157,992,512 | 33,704 | \$30,973,976 | 19.6% | 24,646.50 | \$30,068,730 | \$5,055,600 | \$35,124,330 | 22.2% | \$35,124,330 |
| Victor Valley | 9 | \$56,231,441 | 19,005 | \$17,465,595 | 31.1% | 8,883.44 | \$10,837,797 | \$2,850,750 | \$13,688,547 | 24.3% | \$17,465,595 |
| West Hills | 5 | \$38,664,606 | 9,660 | \$8,877,540 | 23.0% | 4,848.79 | \$5,915,524 | \$1,449,000 | \$7,364,524 | 19.0% | \$8,877,540 |
| West Kern | 6 | \$25,166,575 | 4,816 | \$4,425,904 | 17.6% | 2,698.42 | \$3,292,072 | \$722,400 | \$4,014,472 | 16.0% | \$4,425,904 |
| West Valley-Mission | 4 | \$75,368,121 | 9,117 | \$8,378,523 | 11.1% | 10,692.40 | \$13,044,728 | \$1,367,550 | \$14,412,278 | 19.1% | \$14,412,278 |
| Yosemite | 5 | \$98,219,989 | 28,063 | \$25,789,897 | 26.3% | 15,218.40 | \$18,566,448 | \$4,209,450 | \$22,775,898 | 23.2% | \$25,789,897 |
| Yuba | 2 | \$50,924,003 | 12,292 | \$11,296,348 | 22.2% | 7,132.37 | \$8,701,491 | \$1,843,800 | \$10,545,291 | 20.7% | \$11,296,348 |
| <i>Statewide Totals >></i> | | \$6,950,973,273 | 1,519,299 | \$1,396,235,781 | 20.1% | 1,012,721.3 | \$1,235,520,023 | \$227,894,850 | \$1,463,414,873 | 21.1% | \$1,523,017,625 |
| 2018-19 Constrained TCR >> | | \$7,126,264,389 | | \$ 1,396,235,781 | | \$1,378.70 | | Cost to implement * >> | \$67,179,092 | | \$126,781,844 |
| | | | | 2018-19 Total Allocation | | | | Proportion of 2018-19 Constrained TCR >> | 0.943% | | 1.779% |

* Actual implementation cost will be less than amount shown, insofar as such a scheme replaces the existing "Hold Harmless" provision, and accounting for districts on Basic Aid

** **Percentage of TCR** — is calculated to provide a ballpark sense of how the allocation performs in comparison to SB 361; due to recent rollback activity, the actual ongoing performance under SB 361 may actually be a little higher than the percentage shown. Since the Supplemental Allocation accounts for 20% of total apportionment, a proportion below 20% indicates that the allocation drives a funding **reduction** to the district. For example, Ohlone's allocation at 10.1% of TCR means the district would face a cut of about 9.9% **in total funding**, as a direct impact of the Supplemental Allocation, despite that the district serves a significant population of low-income students.

Illustration prepared by Dave Fouquet, President, Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association

dfouquet@chabotcollege.edu