

Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association

Dave Fouquet, President ♦ (510) 723-6868 ♦ dfouquet@chabotcollege.edu

STATEMENT FROM CLPFA PRESIDENT DAVE FOUQUET

November 22, 2019

Dear members of the SCFF Oversight Committee:

Please consider the comments and recommendations below, pursuant to the Nov. 25 agenda:

Agenda Item 2: First Generation Students

Based on the incomplete information presently available, I would have to concur with Sub 1's recommendation that headcount be *unduplicated*. However, I must point out that the table on page 4 of the Priority One Recommendations (from Nov. 5) shows a substantial estimated impact in the Supplemental Allocation's dollars per point. As such, it seems unconscionable that any critical decisions on this topic would be made without a thorough quantitative analysis, by district, or without vetting the proposals with experts and stakeholders.

Recommendation: Defer action. Add the matter of first-generation students to the scope of the study performed per Agenda Item 3.

Agenda Item 3: Parameters for the Study of the Supplemental Allocation

I refer the Committee to a front page banner article in the local section of Bay Area News Group newspapers, from Sunday, Nov. 10: ***Calls grow for more oversight on funding***. While the article refers to the "LCFF" enacted seven years ago for K-12, I find it powerfully resonant to the topics presently under discussion. Here's a quote from the first paragraph: "...a new state audit has found that the state's landmark school funding law isn't adequately ensuring that targeted money actually is going to the disadvantaged students it's supposed to help." Think about this for a second: What might a comparable article say about the SCFF, five years from now?

Recommendation: As part of examining whether the Supplemental Allocation recognizes disadvantaged students equitably with regard to regional differences in cost of living, I strongly urge the Committee to include, in the study, such questions as:

1. Does there exist an identifiable nexus between the cost of providing additional support for disadvantaged students, and the Supplemental Allocation's impact on *revenue* (compared to FTES-based funding), as felt by each of the 72 districts?
2. Insofar as the Supplemental Allocation causes a district to lose a significant portion of its funding, how can the district realistically be expected to provide additional support for

CONTINUED

its disadvantaged students? (For the purposes of this discussion, it should be noted that *every* district in the California Community Colleges serves a significant proportion economically disadvantaged students.)

3. Given the above, what is the prospective impact on literally *hundreds of thousands* of disadvantaged students served by districts from which the Supplemental Allocation imposes a *reduction* of funding, compared to the prior FTES-based funding model?
4. More specifically, regarding those disadvantaged students served by a district from which the Supplemental Allocation imposes a *severe* (2% to 10%) cut in apportionment: to what degree is the SCFF compliant with the legislative intent of providing additional support for all disadvantaged students, through an enhancement of programs and services? In concert with this question: to what extent does the Supplemental Allocation meet the Committee's definition of Equity, which requires that added support be provided in a way that has equal impact for all disadvantaged students, statewide?
5. Looking to the future, when the SCFF is audited to determine whether targeted money is actually going to serve disadvantaged students, what will the audit conclude with regard to the experience of students served by districts that are forced, by the Supplemental Allocation, to enact draconian reductions to their programs and services?

I don't think there's any question that we share a common goal of ensuring that the Supplemental Allocation supports *all* of our low-income and underrepresented students. In order to accomplish this goal equitably, however, I strongly urge the Committee to seek truthful and quantitative answers to the questions provided here.

Many thanks for your kind attention,

—*Dave Fouquet*

President, Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association