

Remarks from Dave Fouquet to the SCFF Oversight Committee

September 4, 2019

My name is Dave Fouquet; I teach mathematics at Chabot College, and I'm the President of the Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association.

I've been studying the SCFF deeply for the last year and a half, and have a thing or two to say about Equity. I'm a math guy, and I have numbers.

My comments pertain to the Supplemental Allocation, which, as you know, replaces 20% of SB 361 funding in each district with an allocation based on financial aid points. Maybe you've also heard that it's a "rob Peter to pay Paul" scheme that *re-distributes* about \$1.4 billion worth of taxpayer dollars? This is important, because it creates inappropriately large revenue swings that make it virtually impossible to serve California's low-income students equitably.

In the left portion of the table, I've isolated the impacts specific to the Supplemental Allocation, to provide a ballpark glimpse of its impact in each district compared to SB 361. To interpret the Percentage of TCR columns: numbers above 20% represent a funding gain, while numbers below represent a cut. Here's an easy example:

At Ohlone College, despite a robust population of low-income students (about 5,500 financial aid utilizations, on a credit base of 7,000 FTES.) The Supplemental essentially replaces 20% of their TCR of \$50 million (about \$10 million) with a mere \$5 million, which is just 10% of TCR. That means a draconian 10% cut in the district's *total funding*.

The problem is structural: *It's the revenue swings that will drive results from district to district, not the intent.* [Repeat]

[over]

Statewide, there are about 1.5 million financial aid utilizations recognized in the 2018-19 P2 Apportionment. The tally is shown at the bottom. Would it shock you to learn that about a third of those utilizations (about 560,000) occur in districts for which the Supplemental Allocation drives a negative revenue swing? It **should** shock you. In many districts, the revenue reduction is crippling. But a larger question looms: How do we justify taking resources away from half a million low income students—most of whom live in high cost regions—on the basis of a funding metric that’s supposedly driven by Equity? How does Chancellor Oakley justify that? Maybe you should ask him.

The right-hand part of the handout shows a plausible revamping of the Supplemental Allocation that would support low-income students in reaching equivalent outcomes in a much more consistent way, *in every district throughout the State*. The model would be easy and relatively inexpensive to implement; I’d be happy to take time to discuss it, along with other quantitative analyses with you.

[BASEBALL FENCE ANALOGY?]

But doing nothing about this problem is not an option; that’s basically to say that doing systemic harm to literally hundreds of thousands of low income students is okay. Is it okay? Because if that’s the ruling, you have no basis to talk about Equity, because it’s out of reach. For the students harmed, Equity becomes nothing short of a betrayal.

##