FUNDING FORMULA COMMITTEE | MINUTES

Meeting date **02/01/2019** time **3:00** | Meeting location *District Office Board Room*

Meeting called by	Recurring Meeting	**Attendees**: Cynthia Gordon da Cruz, Kirti Reddy, Noell Adams, Virginia Criswell, Na Liu, Heike Gecox, Tamica Ward, Cindy Robinson, Amir Law, Trish Shannon, Paulette Lino, Diane Brady, Julia Dozier, Andi Schreibman, Mon Khat, Melissa Korber, Rachel Ugale, Guisselle Nunez, Matt Kritscher, Kathy Medina and Dawn Neideffer
Type of meeting	SCFF Budget & Planning	
Facilitator	Ron/Cynthia/Rajinder	
Note taker	Dawn	
Timekeeper	Ron	

AGENDA TOPICS | MEETING COMMENCED AT 3:05

Time allotted | *3 min* | Agenda topic *1.0 APPROVE MINUTES* | Presenter **RON**

Discussion   Ron asked all present to review the December 7th minutes.

Conclusion   Roanna made a motion to approve the minutes. Heike seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Minutes approved	Committee	Action Completed

Time allotted | *2 min* | Agenda topic *2.0 APPROVE AGENDA* | Presenter **RON**

Discussion   No discussion.

Conclusion   Agenda approved.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Agenda approved		

Time allotted | *30 min* | Agenda topic *3.0 Framing Intro* | Presenter *Ron*

Discussion   Ron framed the scope of the meeting: funding model needs a broader view and collective voice, so we as a District can better ourselves. FFC is recommending resources to the PBC in light of the SCFF change as we try to understand and utilize this shared governance process. CLPCCD held a Region 9 SCFF Workshop on January 9, 2019. State representatives and other districts looked at SCFF data and we were able to speak to colleagues in other districts. Ron reviewed the Governor's Budget Proposal. Two areas of focus are 1) COLA and 2) Newsom may be open and receptive to changing the SCFF based on the fact that two dozen community colleges will be negatively impacted by the current SCFF. Also significant is the metric for points awarded to colleges in regard to students completing college level math and English. Currently, if a student registers in spring, said student only has one

semester to complete the two courses. The state's Advisory Work Group that Ron is a part of, made a recommendation to have metric changed so the student gets one full year to complete the two courses. If a student transfers to another state community college, the last college where the student was enrolled and completes said course work, gets the points. A discussion about state metrics ensued.

Conclusion   In regard to SCFF, comparatively speaking, CLPCCD is in good shape. Heike said there is a potential for the students to get hurt if the metrics only look at the dollar amount.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None		

Time allotted | Time **45 min**| Agenda topic Topic **4.0 Philosophy Statement**| Presenter Names | **Cynthia**

Discussion   Conversation about the current philosophy statement and the survey sent to members ensued to determine what to keep in the philosophy statement and what to put in the rubric.

Conclusion   Matt made a motion to accept the philosophy statement as currently presented. Ron called for a show of hands. Eight members voted to for the motion, zero opposed the motion.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Motion passed to accept and approve the Funding Formula Committee's Philosophy Statement as drafted for the 2/1/19 meeting.	Committee	Action completed

Time allotted | **20 min** | Agenda topic **5.0 Facilitated Conversation on Rubric and Application Process**| Presenter **Rajinder and Cynthia**

Discussion   The members and attendees split into two groups. One group discussed the rubric and the second group discussed the application.

Conclusion   Cynthia noted the following outcome from the facilitated conversation about the rubric: 1) clearly define criteria of how to measure the mission. Rubric needs concrete examples for the strong, adequate and limited evidence boxes; example- 'how is equity defined?' or 'how will criteria to meet educational goals be scored' 2) weighing different aspects of the rubric by assigning value to said aspects; not all criteria should be equally weighted 3) cost benefit analysis is important; including concrete way to measure: 'should business offices be involved?' 4) get moving on the project 5) Manager and Dean support is needed 6) alignment is not always relevant 7) demonstrate and make clear that this project is contained and is not ongoing: Multi-year funding limit 8) make the rubric as simple and straightforward as possible 9) [proposed project] demonstrates it is best-suited for this budget and not another categorical fund. Rajinder noted the following outcome from the facilitated conversation about the application: 1) proposals will need to be signed off

by the Dean, Director, VP and President before coming to FFC 2) 'should the applicants be required to present to the FFC with a Q & A period following presentation?' 3) a direct relationship needs to exist between proposed projects and increased supplemental or student success outcomes, including a projected outcome in the application 4) only proposals that are likely to produce high number of supplemental or student success will be considered 5) Stakeholders of funded projects will need to agree to report their actual outcomes to the FFC. Ron asked for a show of hands to vote for one FFC subcommittee or two. Sixteen voted in favor of one subcommittee, two voted in favor of two committees.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Members and attendees voted for one subcommittee under FFC.	Committee	Action completed

---

Time allotted | *15 min* | Agenda topic *6.0Subcommittee Discussion and Volunteers* | Presenter **Ron**

Discussion	Ron called for volunteers for the FFC Subcommittee.
Conclusion	Volunteers are: Bruce Griffin, Dr. Stacey L. Thompson, Dr. Patricia Shannon and Diane Brady.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
1. Schedule the Subcommittee's first meeting	Dawn	2/22/19

Time allotted | *5 min* | Agenda topic *7.0 SCFF Metric Presentation on Financial Aid* | Presenter **Andi and Kathy**

Discussion	Kathy and Andi presented their slide on Financial Aid (FA). FA application can be very difficult, especially for ESL students. ESL students also have trouble getting through FAFSA. Many applications get rejected because they are incomplete. Regular email communications are sent to students to complete applications but largely go out without a response. Texting option may be a solution through a software program called Campus Logic (CL). Regarding file review and awarding, it is currently a manual and very detailed process. Issues with signatures and other incomplete criteria create delays and/or students not receiving FA when they are eligible. There has been a chronic problem of lack of staffing in FA. Proposed software is compatible with Banner and Class Web and will free up staff time. Applicants can e-sign applications. CL is a more modern and intuitive for staff and students.
Conclusion	Current Financial Aid is largely a manual process. Thousands of students apply for FA and do not get it because of mistakes on the application; there is a low student response to correct applications, hence students who qualify for FA are not receiving it. Bruce pointed out that text messages may get ignored if too many are sent. Initiatives proposed are to free up staffing. More staff is needed to get more

applicants awarded FA. CL will provide a much higher rate of application completion rates. CL reduces phone call volume, students get paid faster, and forms can be completed with commonly owned devices such as Smart Phones. CL is expected to improve financial aid document submission and completion, significantly reduce the gap between the number of students who do not complete FAFSA application, CL will free up staff time so staff can do further outreach to students in order for more students to apply which will increase awarded college grants. Bruce feels this project hits all the touch points to reach goals and fits in the hold harmless timeframe.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None		

Time allotted | *Ongoing* | Agenda topic *8.0 Wrap-Up* | Presenter **ALL**

Discussion **Conclusion**	Ron asked if there were questions, concerns or anything for the good of the order. None were noted.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None		

Future Agenda Items
No discussion.

Future Meeting Dates

March 1

April 5

May 3

| **Meeting adjourned at 5:05**