

Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: CLPFA PRESIDENT DAVE FOUQUET

Submitted December 6, 2019

Dear members of the SCFF Oversight Committee:

Pursuant to Agenda Item 3.2 (December 11 meeting), I refer to the Implementation Plan for the Supplemental Allocation Study described in the Priority One Recommendations Report dated December 4. My comments pertain to the five bullet questions on page 5 of the Report. (*Note: The comments below may be taken as an update to the specific questions posed in my statement for the November 25 meeting.*)

♦ **First and Third questions:** These look OK.

♦ **Second question:** *“How are college districts using funding from the Supplemental Allocation to support students?”* — I recommend a quantitative approach, that the study be designed to investigate the nexus between the additional dollars that districts receive under the Supplemental Allocation, and the actual costs they incur, to implement or expand their programs and services that provide additional support for their low-income students.

♦ **Fourth question:** *“How is the Supplemental Allocation impacting college districts that have lost funding? How have programs and services changed?”* — I strongly caution the Committee that the question fails to address the potential impact, if the Hold Harmless sunsets without the inequities in the Supplemental Allocation being fixed. From all I can tell, negatively impacted districts are deferring harmful actions for as long as possible, in hopes that the legislature doesn't end the Hold Harmless in a way that forces a decimation of programs and services.

FOLLOW UP: Insofar as the Supplemental Allocation causes a district to lose a significant portion of its funding, can the district realistically be expected to provide additional support for the disadvantaged students it serves? (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.)

— CONTINUED —

♦ **Fifth question:** “*What is the true cost of attending college, and how does it compare to the financial aid needs of students?*” — For all inquiries surrounding this question, it is crucial that the study investigate the disparities resulting from regional differences in cost of living.

FOLLOW UP 1: To what extent do regional differences in cost of living impact the ability of economically disadvantaged students to *access financial aid*?

FOLLOW UP 2: To what extent do regional differences in cost of living impact the *proportion* of economically disadvantaged students who are able to access financial aid, in any given district?

FOLLOW UP 3: Considering how lower utilization rates for financial aid result in reduced funding, we have to ask: *How many hundreds of thousands of economically disadvantaged students are served by districts for which the Supplemental Allocation would impose a severe (2% to 10%) cut in apportionment?* If we do nothing, those students will be denied essential resources to help them succeed. Given that, how do we need to adjust the Supplemental Allocation, to ensure that it complies with the legislative intent that *additional support* be provided in such a way that has equal impact for all disadvantaged students, statewide?

Lastly, in my comments from Nov. 25, I referenced a recent audit to the LCFF (for K-12 funding model) that showed how targeted money is failing to reach the disadvantaged students it’s supposed to help. I bring this up again, to ask: Looking to the future, at such time that a similar audit to the SCFF is performed, what will it conclude in regard to how we are serving our own disadvantaged students? It’s an important question.

Kind thanks for your attention,

—*Dave Fouquet*

President, Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association