

COLLEGE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, April 11, 2017 • 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. • N-206

Members: Hsieh, Bell, Hopkins, Ramsey, McMahon, Hubbard, Allen, & Marin (absent)

Attendees: Beitey (absent), Jacobson, Ascione, Miramontez, & Honda

McMahon called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

A. Approval of the Agenda

Hsieh moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Ramsey, and all responded in favor.

B. Approval of Previous Minutes

Bell moved to approve the 4/4/17 minutes, seconded by Hsieh, and all responded in favor.

C. Guests/Introductions

Laura Murphy, Fred Garces, Xi Zhang, Jacque Honda, and Lynne Ornelas were introduced, and Briele Warren (who was taking minutes for Steve Quis).

D. Updates from the Chancellor's Cabinet

Hsieh reported that she invited all of the Deans to the meeting due to important information in the enrollment report. Hsieh had reminded the Chancellor's Cabinet that according to the PowerPoint presentation the Chancellor had shared with the accreditation team the previous month, Miramar was the only college who has a higher enrollment target than the 15/16 enrollment target. Hsieh noted that the actual funded cap was 44,214 FTES, and the District is below the cap, so they would need to add additional courses and classes for summer. Hsieh was given a task by Chancellor to confirm if Miramar could do 88 FTES or more. Hsieh commented on the summer sections attachment, and noted that if the college uses 70% across the board and divides by different categories, Miramar was being projected at 1,721.01. Hsieh said the college is 663 away from 10,000 FTES, as the listed 2016-17 target is 9,337.0 FTES. Hsieh said that the coming year would be a tough year, but a deciding one for the college. McMahon mentioned that other resources such as discretionary funds would need to be discussed. Bell noted that there was proportional increase to the discretionary budget. Hsieh said that she would make a case for the classified staff, and reminded the group that the college did increase by quite a few classified staff members using the general fund restricted source the previous year. Hsieh commented that there was no funding for additional faculty at this time.

Hsieh shared the SDCCD 17-18 preliminary budget attachment, and showed that there was an economic slowdown. The proposed growth is 1.34%, but it could be as low as 1%. The Guided Pathways (the statewide chancellor's priority) has \$150 million from Prop 98 money. Access (growth) dollars would be used to support nearly 50,000 students system-wide to ensure student success and equity. A 1.48% COLA will go to RAF. There was also \$43.7 million in one-time funding to support deferred maintenance and instructional equipment (IELM). With regard to the District, the funding cap is 44,400, and Hsieh reminded everyone of the high cost of District and personal contributions in terms of CalSTRS and CalPERS. There was a reserve balance of \$22.6 million as of 3/31/17.

Bell, Hubbard, and McMahon confirmed that this information had also been presented at the budget development meeting.

Beitey left at 1:52 p.m.

Hsieh shared that for accreditation, the District/colleges have received no reports thus far.

For the San Diego Promise, Hsieh presented that they have tried to evaluate the performance of the students currently in two-year program. One year into the program, there was an issue of students who did not meet the minimum GPA or units requirements. Hsieh noted three recommendations/options to address this issue at the bottom of the San Diego Promise attachment. Hsieh noted to Ramsey that the Chancellor's requirement was that all incoming San Diego Promise students were required to enroll in Personal Growth classes. Hsieh asked for Ramsey to work with Ascione to be on top of this, as this would be a district-wide communication.

Hsieh asked Hopkins (in Quis' absence) regarding marketing, and Hopkins said Quis had taken care of it. Hsieh asked about Ramsey's InReach, and what has been done in addition to the A-frames? Ramsey responded that Sonny Nguyen and Quis had made additional efforts for the information station in K-building during high traffic hours. Hsieh asked for Ramsey to follow up specifically on marketing inside and outside of the buildings.

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan

Hsieh reported that for the immigration issue, the Chancellor had said that everyone must work with the respective student affairs offices regarding parameters.

Hsieh shared that the April 13th Board meeting would be held at Continuing Education, as well as the April 18th Joint Board meeting with San Diego Unified. For the April 27th Board meeting, Miramar has two agenda items – one is BSSOT money for acceptance, and the other is for the Center for Advanced Transportation and Renewables. Hsieh noted that the latter item would be pulled, since it was for 17/18 fiscal year and was too early to process. Bell said that this would have to be followed up on, since the state was requiring signatures on the contract now. Hsieh asked for Bell to send documentation to her to handle it.

Honda and Ornelas left at 2:05 p.m.

E. New Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>2016-17 Miramar College-wide Research Agenda (attachment) Zhang reported that they added a few new items to the research agenda, but kept the same format. One additional item was strong workforce (continuous funding source) and they had also added BSSOT (new 5-year grant) and the ISLO survey (reoccurring request). For now the cycle was annual, but this could be modified for the college’s need. Hsieh said that the management had no further concerns, and support it. McMahan said she could present the changes to the Academic Senate.</p> <p><i>Garces and Zhang left at 2:07p.m.</i></p>	1	I & III	Zhang & Miramontez
2	<p>Fall 2017 Convocation Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web Demo • Progress Report on Accreditation Action Items & Follow Up <p>Hsieh said that if there were no additional ideas than the above listed, they would carry forward, as they will need to prepare. Murphy asked about the possibility of SLO day, and Hsieh said it would be the Friday after Convocation (which was Thursday). McMahan said part of the report of the accreditation items follow up would likely involve Murphy. Bell commented that historically, he was asked to give a budge update in the fall. He would be fine either way, but knowing would help him to start gathering data for the presentation. Hsieh thanked Bell for the reminder, and said they would include this presentation for a total of three. Hsieh said if she did not hear from the Classified Senate by the end of the day, she and McMahan would proceed with the planning.</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Hsieh & McMahan
3	<p>Weekend College Hopkins reported that Mara Palma-Sanft was doing her analysis on what degrees could be 100% online, and they came up with more than ten. They would discuss this at next week’s Academic Affairs. Hsieh said that Cabinet had been discussing enrollment management for 17-18, and needed to look at it differently now with the funding. Mary Kjartanson was also involved in this discussion, as well as all of the Vice Presidents regarding student and college support services. They are waiting for the fall schedule to determine where the needs will be.</p>	1, 2, & 3	II & III	Bell, Hopkins, & Ramsey
4	<p>Delinquent SLOs Outcome Assessment (due 4/27/17) Murphy reported that all of the department chairs were being affiliated with the courses of their respective departments, and they were going to have complete access. Murphy is giving a weekly update at Deans Council on this list, as well as meeting with the</p>	1	II	Hopkins & Murphy

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for **San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan**

	<p>departments and individuals who are delinquent. Murphy wanted to make sure that point people would be given information on the activities that needed to happen. She developed checklists for looking at program review, and what is in there with regard to outcomes assessment. Hsieh said this was a comprehensive overview, and asked that for departments who had identified contacts or liaisons who were not necessarily department chairs, were those individuals still in place, or would the process need to go back to the drawing board? Hsieh mentioned that KJartanson should be part of the discussion. Murphy responded that she had talked to KJartanson, and although they had list of liaisons in the past, there was no incentive either way for those individuals. Some took the role seriously and some did not. At this point, Murphy believed they needed to start over. Bell said Murphy had mentioned that there was an increase to calculated FTEF reassigned time for department chairs, and if there was discussion or a movement to parse that out (who was being released or replaced), he would need to know for payroll, because they are getting ready for budget development. Ascione noted that there was a CBA matter as well. Hopkins commented that the Deans needed to be actively involved in this with regard to the release time for the chairs. Hsieh asked for Hopkins to follow up with Human Resources on this matter to clarify with them. Murphy said whoever is assigned to these positions would need to be responsible for them. The expectations and responsibilities would need to be clearly communicated to the faculty.</p>			
5	<p>Revised Student Equity Plan (attachment) Ramsey reported that last year when they did the Student Equity plan, they had received feedback from state chancellor's office, so the SSSP & Student Equity advisory group got together and addressed the comments. The revised Student Equity plan reflects these changes. There was one piece they are still working on with Miramontez' area. There was not a requirement to do a revised plan, but Miramar has always done an equity plan. McMahon thought the topic would be appropriate as an information item, and Hubbard said she would like to take it back to the Classified at their next week's meeting.</p>	1 & 3	II	Ramsey

F. Old Business

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>College-wide Alignment & State 2017-2019 Integrated Plan (due 12/1/17) Miramontez reported that they had an alignment meeting yesterday, and were stuck on phase 1, which was partially done. They will be moving on to phase 2 once the first phase is completed.</p>	1	I, II, & III	Miramontez
2	<p>Progress on 8 Accreditation Recommendations (attachment) Hsieh noted that the Vice Presidents were taking the leads on the eight accreditation recommendations. McMahon and Murphy had presented the table attachment to their last meeting and were also taking action to address the identified gaps. Ramsey said that student services had established a schedule for working/updating/meeting the established timelines. He had people following up on them, with another meeting scheduled on Friday. They were meeting every week going forward to bring back pieces of this, and there was a plan in place, with all of the student services leaders involved. Hopkins reported that instruction was working on #1-5, and have action items and people responsible. They are addressing this year's program review. They have the course sequencing plan in place, which will be</p>	1	I, II, III, & IV	Miramontez, Bell, Hopkins, & Ramsey

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan

	<p>finished and on the website by end of June. Hopkins noted that one of the problems is that the recommendation indicates ‘college catalog,’ which would be difficult to do since it is a stock standard for all three campuses. They would be addressing this.</p> <p>A question was raised by Ramsey and addressed regarding #1 of the attachment, and how the program missions alignment with the college mission.</p> <p>Bell reported that administrative services was taking #1 and #3. They had taken the college mission, broke it into three components, and were aligning them. They have not started #3 yet, but will start working on it on April 19th.</p> <p>It was asked who was responsible for #6, #7 and #8, and Miramontez commented that on PIEC, they were charged with the status update, and he and Murphy were working on it.</p> <p>Hsieh noted that all five lead players were in the room, and wanted the five of them to come together to be the presenters at Convocation.</p>			
3	<p>Professional Development Taskforce Update <i>Tabled due to lack of time.</i></p>	1	I	McMahon

G. Place Holders

#	Item	*Strategic Goals	Accreditation Standard	Initiator
1	<p>Progress On Activities Focused on Increasing Faculty Use of OER <i>Tabled due to lack of time.</i></p>	1 & 3	II	McMahon
2	<p>Performing Arts Center Capital Campaign – Proposed Instructional Program Plan <i>Tabled due to lack of time.</i></p>	1, 2, 3, & 4	II & III	Ascione
3	<p>Report on Implementation of Cultural & Ethnic Diversity Plan (Report in April 2017 & November 2017) <i>Tabled due to lack of time.</i></p>	3	I, III, & IV	Hubbard & Arancibia

H. Reports

(Please limit each following report to two minutes maximum. If you have any handouts, please email them to Briele Warren ahead of time to be included for distribution electronically).

- Academic Senate
Tabled due to lack of time.
- Classified Senate
Tabled due to lack of time.
- Associated Student Government
Tabled due to lack of time.
- District Governance Council
Tabled due to lack of time.
- District Strategic Planning Committee
Tabled due to lack of time.
- Budget Planning and Development Council
Tabled due to lack of time.
- College Governance Committee
Tabled due to lack of time.

I. Announcements

There were no announcements.

J. Adjourn

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan

The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

As a courtesy, please let the College and Academic Senate Presidents know if you will be unable to attend the meeting.

*** San Diego Miramar College 2013 – 2019 Strategic Goals**

Goal 1: Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.

Goal 2: Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.

Goal 3: Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.

Goal 4: Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

Please also see <http://www.sdmiramar.edu/institution/plan> for San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Plan

San Diego Community College District
2016/17 Outlook
FTES Compared to Targets (Resident Only)
As of April 8, 2017

	Summer 2016		Inter-session			Summer 2017			2016-17 Total	2016-17 Target	Difference Projected vs. 2016-17 Target	
	Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16	Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17	Fall 2016	Inter-session 2017	Spring 2017	Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17	Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17	Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18*				
City/ECC												
Credit	1,128.3	111.1	4,684.1	116.7	4,548.0	1,128.3	0.0	111.1	10,588.2	10,866.4		
Non-Credit	0	5.6	31.0	0.0	28.4	0	0.0	5.6	65.0	63.6		
Total	1,128.3	116.6	4,715.2	116.7	4,576.4	1,128.3	0.0	116.6	10,653.2	10,930.0	-276.8	-2.5%
Mesa												
Credit	1,433.1	175.1	6,830.0	293.9	6,661.8	1,738.1	0.0	175.1	15,698.9	15,695.0		
Non-Credit	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Total	1,433.1	175.1	6,830.0	293.9	6,661.8	1,738.1	0.0	175.1	15,698.9	15,695.0	3.9	0.0%
Miramar												
Credit	762.8	80.2	3,354.6	159.9	3,466.4	948.8	0.0	80.2	8,009.9	7,778.5		
Academy	20.5	79.5	217.6	0.0	361.3	20.5	0.0	79.5	678.9	754.2		
In-Service	248.8	25.0	139.3	5.8	124.8	248.8	0.0	25.0	543.7	783.8		
Non-Credit	0	1.3	9.0	0.0	9.7	0	0.0	1.3	20.1	20.5		
Total	1,032.0	186.0	3,720.4	165.7	3,962.2	1,218.0	0.0	186.0	9,252.4	9,337.0	-84.5	-0.9%
College Total	3,593.4	477.7	15,265.6	576.3	15,200.4	4,084.4	0.0	477.7	35,804.5	35,962.0	-357.5	-1.0%
College Total w/ F-Factor									35,646.2	35,962.0	-315.8	-0.9%
Continuing Ed												
Regular	110.2	209.6	758.5	0.0	725.2	110.2	0.0	209.6	1,803.5	1,870.1	-66.6	-3.6%
CDCP	380.8	744.4	2,748.6	0.0	2,529.7	380.8	0.0	744.4	6,403.5	6,607.9	-204.4	-3.1%
Total	490.9	953.9	3,507.2	0.0	3,254.9	490.9	0.0	953.9	8,206.9	8,478.0	-271.1	-3.2%
Total w/ F-Factor									8,375.4	8,478.0	-102.6	-1.2%
Credit Total	3,593.4	470.9	15,225.5	576.3	15,162.3	4,084.4	0.0	470.9	35,519.4	35,877.9	-358.5	-1.0%
Non-Credit												
Regular (w/ College NC)	110.2	216.5	798.6	0.0	763.3	110.2	0.0	216.5	1,888.5	1,954.1	-65.6	-3.4%
CDCP	380.8	744.4	2,748.6	0.0	2,529.7	380.8	0.0	744.4	6,403.5	6,607.9	-204.4	-3.1%
Total	490.9	960.8	3,547.2	0.0	3,293.0	490.9	0.0	100.0	8,292.0	8,562.0	-270.0	-3.2%
District Total	4,084.3	1,431.7	18,772.8	576.3	18,455.4	4,575.3	0.0	1,431.7	43,811.4	44,440.0	-628.5	-1.4%
District Total w/ F-Factor									44,021.5	44,440.0	-418.4	-0.9%

Source: SDCCD Information System

Actual Funded Cap 44,241.0 -219.5 -0.5%
Base 43,286.0 735.5 1.7%

1. Credit Colleges - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 are actuals. Intersession 2017 FTES are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are projections based on Fall 2016 yields and spring sections. Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17, Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17, and Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18 are estimates.

2. In-Service/Academy - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 FTES are actuals. Intersession 2017 FTES are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are estimates based on Spring 2016 actuals. It is assumed that the year-long in-services classes will end on or before June 30, 2017 and be claimed in Summer 1 Claim 2016/17. 230 In-Service/Academy FTES planned for 2016/17 were claimed in 2015/16. 230 FTES moved from Miramar College's In-Service/Academy target and redistributed to the credit total as of February 18, 2017. F-Factor is included in college targets.

3. Continuing Education - Summer 1 Claim in 2015/16 and Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17 are actuals. Fall 2016 are actuals. Spring 2017 FTES are estimates based on Spring 2016. Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17, Summer 2 Claim in 2016/17, and Summer 2 Claim in 2017/18 are estimates.

4. Summer 1 classes end on or before June 30; Summer 2 class census dates fall on or before June 30.

*FTES must be claimed in 2017/18 due to end dates.

5. Summer Augmentation - Additional FTES were added to Mesa and Miramar College (305 and 186, respectively) as of March 7, 2017 for Summer 1 Claim in 2016/17.

6. Funded Cap - Actual funded Cap as of 04/02/17. Initial Estimated Funded Cap was 44,000 FTES.

Targets are as of August 2016 Chancellor's Cabinet



Proposed Second Summer Augmentation

Chancellor's Cabinet
April 11, 2017

Total FTES Augmentation: 220

Recommended Distribution:

60% Mesa

40% Miramar

College	FTES Augmented	FTEF*	Total Summer FTES
Mesa	132	8.8	2045
Miramar	88	5.9	1624
Total	220	14.7	—

*Based upon 15 FTES/1 FTEF

Table 1. Summer 2017 Day Sections

		Sections	FTEF	Projected FTES at 70%	Projected FTES at 80%
Day	City College/ECC	303	40.60	641.92	733.62
	Mesa College	409	73.88	1,034.20	1,181.94
	Miramar College	325	47.77	1,205.02	1,303.45
	Continuing Education	1,412	92.50	---	---
	Total	2,449	254.75	2,881.15	3,219.01

Source: SDCCD Information System

Table 2. Summer 2017 Evening Sections

		Sections	FTEF	Projected FTES at 70%	Projected FTES at 80%
Evening	City College/ECC	77	12.17	202.70	231.65
	Mesa College	75	11.14	159.48	182.26
	Miramar College	33	6.10	74.34	84.96
	Continuing Education	374	29.86	---	---
	Total	559	59.27	436.51	498.87

Source: SDCCD Information System

Table 3. Summer 2017 Online Sections

		Sections	FTEF	Projected FTES at 70%	Projected FTES at 80%
Online	City College/ECC	129	24.36	396.10	452.68
	Mesa College	216	41.45	611.64	699.02
	Miramar College	155	28.48	441.65	504.74
	Continuing Education	44	4.25	---	---
	Total	544	98.53	1,449.39	1,656.45

Source: SDCCD Information System

Table 4. Summer 2017 All Sections

		Sections	FTEF	Projected FTES at 70%	Projected FTES at 80%
All	City College/ECC	509	77.12	1,240.71	1,417.96
	Mesa College	700	126.47	1,805.32	2,063.22
	Miramar College	513	82.35	1,721.01	1,893.15
	Continuing Education	1,830	126.61	---	---
	District	3,552	412.55	4,767.05	5,374.33

Source: SDCCD Information System

Note. The FTES projections are based on the course capacity. Continuing Education sections do not have a value for capacity.

State Budget Development Process

- Preliminary Budget planning is based upon the Governor's January Budget Proposal, which is the initial proposal for the state's 2017-18 budget that was released on January 10, 2017.
- Legislative Analyst Office's (LAO) analysis of the Governor's budget proposal is compared with the Department of Finance's (DOF) projections.
- Legislative budget hearings are held to work out differences.
- Governor's May revision to the state budget must be released by May 15th each year.
- Governor's "May Revise" will provide additional information to be used in planning for the 2017-18 Tentative and Adopted Budget.

3

Governor Brown's 2017-18 Proposed State Budget

- As noted by the CCLC, the "January budget proposal reflects initial signs of an economic slowdown coupled with uncertainty about federally-funded programs. Governor Brown's budget reflects concern with appropriating one-time funds for ongoing purposes, and emphasizes that the current spending trajectory will lead to a state budget deficit." Therefore, the Governor continues to emphasize prudent fiscal practices to ensure a balanced state budget.
- The Governor proposes a nearly \$12.4 billion General Fund Budget for community colleges for 2017-18 with a focus on improving student outcomes through timely completion, closing any gaps in access and achievement between historically underrepresented students and their peers, and implementation of practices that increase student transitions to other systems of higher education.
- Governor Brown's budget proposes an additional investment in student success by including \$150 million in one-time Proposition 98 funds for grants to support community colleges' efforts to design "academic roadmaps and transfer pathways" detailing the courses students must take to completion of their educational goals. It is the intent that these "Guided Pathways" programs will provide for an integrated, institution-wide approach to improve student success.

4

2017-18 Budget Highlights identified by State Chancellor Oakley

- State Chancellor Oakley has called the Governor's Budget "good news for community college students. It demonstrates continued confidence in our colleges and provides additional resources to build upon investments made by the state over the past few years aimed at improving student outcomes and fulfilling the promise of a quality college credential for more Californians."
- The 2017- 18 state budget proposal provides continuing support for programs designed to ensure student success and equity for:
 - Access (growth) additional dollars for nearly 50,000 more students system-wide.
 - Improving and expanding of efforts to build a stronger workforce to meet the state's economic demands leading to jobs that will help to strengthen families, communities, and the state, and
 - Efforts to improve remedial education to continue efforts to close achievement gaps in order to help more students enter our community colleges, and, to achieve their educational goals, including transiting to other institutions of higher education.

5

SDCCD Budget Planning Assumptions

- Governor Brown's proposal for community colleges includes :
 - ❖ \$94.1 million for a 1.48% COLA.
 - SDCCD's share estimated to be \$3.3 million, which would be addressed in accordance with the RAF.
 - ✓ ❖ \$79.3 million to fund a system-wide 1.34% in growth funding. — 170
 - SDCCD's share will be approximately \$2.8 million, which will be addressed in accordance with the RAF.
 - ❖ \$23.6 million to fund continuous base operating dollars to address the increase in operating costs, funding is especially intended to offset the significant increased costs associated with CalSTRS and CalPERS pension systems.
 - SDCCD's share is estimated at \$826,000, which will be addressed in accordance with the RAF.
 - ❖ \$52.3 million to support Proposition 39 energy efficiency program grants.
 - SDCCD eligibility is anticipated to be \$1.83 million upon submission and approval of projects by the CCCCC.
 - ❖ \$43.7 million in one-time funding to support deferred maintenance and instructional equipment.
 - SDCCD share estimated to be \$1.53 million, split 60% Facilities (approximately \$920K) and 40% Instructional Equipment (approximately \$610K).

6

SDCCD Budget Planning Assumptions

Governor Brown's proposal also includes one-time grant opportunity funding for community colleges for the following:

- ❖ \$150 million in one-time grant funding for the "Guided Pathways" program, which is focused on improving student access and outcomes. Selection for community college programs to be funded to be determined by the CCCCO.
- ❖ \$20 million in one-time funds for an Innovation Awards program. Eligibility of community college's proposal for this project will be determined by the CCCCO.
- ❖ \$5.4 million to fund the projected 1.48% COLA to Apprenticeship, Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS), and Disabled Student Program Services (DSPS).
- ❖ \$3.1 million for enrollment growth in the full-time Student success Grant program.

Guided Pathway

7

SDCCD Enrollment Management Planning for 2017-18 Budget

- The CCCCO currently projects the District will be funded in 2016-17 for 44,241 FTEs, which would become the 2017-18 Base FTEs if all is funded at "Recal" for FY 2016-17.
- The 2016-17 Adopted Budget was developed based upon a FTEs target of 44,400. (Note: The District's FTEs target included 1% unfunded FTEs.) *400*
- If the District is fully funded at 44,241 FTEs and the 1.48% state growth continues to exist, the District could be eligible for 44,896 FTEs funding.
- However, the current State Growth formula, which was placed into law in 2014-15 is redirecting growth funds to districts that are located in areas where there are large populations of underserved students and high poverty levels. This redirection restricts growth funding for districts such as SDCCD that do not meet either of those criteria; thereby, reducing how much growth the District may actually be eligible to receive.
- Pending release of the Governor's May Revision and the state's ongoing budget development process prior to budget adoption in June 2017, the Preliminary and Tentative Budgets will remain flat at 44,400 FTEs.

8

SDCCD Budget Impacts in 2017-18

- Oracle PeopleSoft, ISIS, SAM and Colleague hardware, software and server maintenance annual costs continue to be approximately \$3.0 million a year until PeopleSoft is fully implemented for Finance, Human Resources and Student Services administrative operations.
- Winding down of Proposition S and N continues to result in buildings coming on-line, which impacts general funds in order to support the associated M&O costs of the new buildings.
- CalSTRS, CalPERS and Worker's Compensation contribution rate changes estimated to result in increased mandated benefit costs in FY 2017-18 of \$3.9 million.
- Health and Welfare benefits (Health, Dental and Vision) are projected to result in approximately \$1.1 million increase in fringe benefit costs as compared to FY 2016-17 costs.

9

SDCCD Budget Impacts in 2017-18 (cont'd)

District's strategy to address CalSTRS/PERS Employer Contribution Rate increases:

- Increase cost of employer contribution rates for CalSTRS/PERS will result in more than double the employer cost by FY 2020-21 for both pension systems as compared to FY 2013-14 (benchmark year).
- CalSTRS employer contribution cost increase based upon the FY 2013-14 benchmark year will be approximately \$1.8 million more than FY 2016-17 expense. CalPERS employer contribution cost increase based upon the 2013-14 benchmark year will increase approximately \$2.1 million for a combined total increased expenditure for employer pension cost in 2017-18 of \$XXX million.
- District and Employee Unit Representatives reached agreement in FY 2015-16 RAF discussions on a strategy to set aside funding to address the annual increases.
- As of January 2016, the District's Designated Reserve Fund established by the Board of Trustees at the December 10, 2015 Board meeting to address the annual expense increases to the CalSTRS/PERS employer contribution rate increases, has a balance of \$22.6 million as of March 31, 2017.

10



*37% 50 students
didn't meet
GPA and/or unit
requirement*

Recommendations for Program Continuation in Year 2

1) **Exceptions to program requirements:**

A. Completion of 24 units

- Students who successfully complete 18-23.5 units can appeal to the Promise Coordinator based upon extenuating circumstances
 - Appeal by June 30
 - Units completed in summer applicable
- Students who successfully complete 12-17.5 units can appeal to the Promise Coordinator to be considered for a part-time track based upon extenuating circumstances
 - Appeal by June 30
 - Units completed in summer applicable
- Students who successfully complete fewer than 12 units
 - Not eligible to participate for Year Two
 - Remain eligible for services
 - College will continue to provide intervention services

B. GPA/Lack of Progress Deficiencies

- If lose BOGW – no longer eligible for program
 - Option to appeal through Promise Coordinator to continue in Program
 - June 30 – appeals finalized
- If on academic/lack of progress probation
 - Option to appeal
 - June 30 appeal finalized

C. Community Service Hours → *on campus (2nd level)*

- No exceptions

2) **Other Recommendations**

- a. Allow students to select a part-time track in the first year (must complete 15 units in the year)
- b. Require Personal Growth class (college preparation) for all participants in the summer preceding the first fall semester → *Per Chancellor, it is required. (UPSS/VPI)*
- c. Consider *Pay it Forward* program for textbooks
 - Students return books to bookstore; credit return to SD Promise for future use



Fall 2016 Final Student Outcomes

- Out of the 186 program participants in Fall 2016, 63% (117) met both the GPA and unit requirements by the end of the term.

Earned a minimum 2.0 GPA		Completed 12+ units		12+ units and minimum 2.0 GPA	
142	76%	122	66%	117	63%

- 34% (64) earned less than 12 units, however the majority of these students (43) completed at least 6 units.
 - By Ethnicity
 - The percentage of students who completed 12 or more units was greater for Filipino students (92%) compared to all other ethnic groups in the program. African-American students had the lowest percentage to complete 12 or more units (50%).
 - Filipino students and White students had the highest average GPAs in the program (3.40 and 3.37) and almost all ethnic groups had higher average GPAs than other first-time, full-time students (see Table 2.3).
- Overall students in the program had higher success rates, retention rates, and average GPAs compared to all other first-time, full-time students (see Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3).
 - By Ethnicity
 - African-American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Latino students in the program had lower success rates (68%, 77%, and 74%) and lower average GPAs (2.92, 2.74, and 2.62) compared to other ethnic groups in the program; however, African-American and Latino students had higher success rates and average GPAs compared to all other first-time, full-time students (see Tables 2.1 and 2.3).
 - Almost all ethnic groups in the program had higher retention rates compared to all other first-time, full-time students (see Table 2.2).
 - By DSPS Status
 - DSPS students in the program had higher success and retention rates (83% and 100%) than non-DSPS students in the program, however they had lower average GPAs (2.62).
 - DSPS Promise students had higher success and retention rates than all other first-time, full-time DSPS students and equivalent average GPAs (see Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3).

- **By EOPS Status**
 - **EOPS students in the program had higher success rates (80%) and higher average GPAs (2.83) compared to non-EOPS students and compared to all other first-time, full-time EOPS students (see Tables 2.1 and 2.3).**
 - **Retention rates for EOPS students in the program were equivalent to non-EOPS students in the program and equivalent to all other first-time, full-time EOPS students (see Table 2.2).**
- **By Adult Education Status**
 - **Promise students who were previously enrolled in Continuing Education had higher average GPAs (3.06) and equivalent success and retention rates (78% and 93%) compared to non-CE students in the program (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2).**

Addendum

Fall 2016 Student Outcomes College Promise Students - Units Earned

Table 1.1. Units Earned by Ethnicity

	African American		American Indian		Asian/Pacific Islander		Filipino		Latino		White		Other/ Unreported	
0 Units	1	13%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	5	4%	0	0%	1	12%
0.1 - 5.9 Units	0	0%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%	8	7%	1	5%	0	0%
6.0 - 8.9 Units	1	13%	0	0%	1	4%	1	8%	11	10%	2	11%	0	0%
9.0 - 11.9 Units	2	25%	1	100%	3	12%	0	0%	18	16%	1	5%	2	25%
12.0+ Units	4	50%	0	0%	17	65%	11	92%	70	63%	15	79%	5	63%
Total	8	100%	1	100%	26	100%	12	100%	112	100%	19	100%	8	100%

Table 1.2. Units Earned by DSPS Status

	DSPS		Non-DSPS	
0 Units	0	0%	9	5%
0.1 - 5.9 Units	1	14%	11	6%
6.0 - 8.9 Units	0	0%	16	9%
9.0 - 11.9 Units	2	29%	25	14%
12.0+ Units	4	57%	118	66%
Total	7	100%	179	100%

Table 1.3. Units Earned by EOPS Status

	EOPS		Non-EOPS	
0 Units	1	3%	8	5%
0.1 - 5.9 Units	3	8%	9	6%
6.0 - 8.9 Units	2	5%	14	9%
9.0 - 11.9 Units	5	13%	22	15%
12.0+ Units	27	71%	95	64%
Total	38	100%	148	100%

Table 1.4. Units Earned by Adult Education Status

	Prior CE		Non-Prior CE	
0 Units	1	4%	8	5%
0.1 - 5.9 Units	1	4%	11	7%
6.0 - 8.9 Units	3	12%	13	8%
9.0 - 11.9 Units	1	4%	26	16%
12.0+ Units	20	77%	102	64%
Total	26	100%	160	100%

Fall 2016 Student Outcomes
College Promise Students Compared to All Other First-Time, Full-Time Students

Table 2.1

Ethnicity	Success Rates		
	College Promise Students	First-Time, Full-Time Students	Difference
African American	68%	66%	2%
American Indian	80%	95%	-15%
Asian/Pacific Islander	77%	83%	-6%
Filipino	94%	80%	14%
Latino	74%	67%	7%
White	85%	76%	9%
Other/Unreported	83%	69%	14%
Average	77%	72%	5%

Table 2.2

Retention Rates		
College Promise Students	First-Time, Full-Time Students	Difference
84%	90%	-6%
100%	95%	5%
93%	93%	0%
100%	93%	7%
94%	90%	4%
92%	91%	1%
92%	91%	1%
94%	91%	3%

Table 2.3

Term GPA		
College Promise Students	First-Time, Full-Time Students	Difference
2.92	2.37	23%
2.08	3.23	-36%
2.74	2.97	-8%
3.40	2.81	21%
2.62	2.39	10%
3.37	2.82	20%
3.24	2.51	29%
2.80	2.59	8%

DSPS Status

DSPS	83%	72%	11%
Non-DSPS	77%	72%	5%
Average	77%	72%	5%

100%	90%	10%
93%	91%	2%
94%	91%	3%

2.62	2.64	-1%
2.81	2.59	8%
2.80	2.59	8%

EOPS Status

EOPS	80%	75%	5%
Non-EOPS	76%	71%	5%
Average	77%	72%	5%

94%	94%	0%
94%	90%	4%
94%	91%	3%

2.83	2.65	7%
2.80	2.59	8%
2.80	2.59	8%

Adult Education Status

Prior CE	78%	---	---
Non-Prior CE	77%	---	---
Average	77%	---	---

93%	---	---
94%	---	---
94%	---	---

3.06	---	---
2.76	---	---
2.80	---	---