



**COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE  
OF CALIFORNIA**

---

**Agenda Item Details**

Meeting	Mar 22, 2013 - CEOCCC Board Meeting - March 22, 2013
Category	5. Education Issues
Subject	5.1 Adult and Noncredit Education
Access	Public
Type	Action, Discussion
Recommended Action	The board should provide guidance to League staff on how to respond to the governor's proposal related to adult education.

---

**Public Content**

**Background**

The governor's January budget proposed creating a \$300 million community college categorical program to implement the "shifting" of adult education from K-12 districts. The governor's proposal, along with responses to it, follow as background for a discussion on how the League should respond to the proposal. The League has heard a divergent array of views from League member districts on the topic, with some arguing that community colleges seize the moment to serve underprepared adults, while others argue that the governor's proposal would stretch the colleges too thin with too little money, too fast.

**Governor's Administration**

The Administration proposes to fund ONLY credit FTES through the main apportionment item; eliminate non-credit and CDCP FTES; reduce the number of categories eligible for funding from 10 to 6 (adult elementary and secondary education, ESL, citizenship and workforce preparation, vocational education, adults with disabilities, and apprenticeship); and disperse the new \$300 M based upon credit FTES.

It is unclear why existing programs are proposed to be "defunded" in the main apportionment item, and then re-established as a separate categorical program. In 2011-12, the system served roughly \$200 million of non-credit and CDCP FTES. The "de-funding" of current non-credit and CDCP in the short term may drive districts which serve this population into budget stability in the short term and compromise their ability to earn growth funding in the year provided. The proposal completely upends the system's business model for delivery non-credit/CDCP FTES and establishes a "mission" component of the system – instruction – as a categorical program.

The \$300 million of new revenue is proposed to be distributed based upon credit FTES with an equal rate provided. This allocation penalizes districts who have historically provided non-credit/CDCP instruction and would result in an allocation significantly less than is now generated under the current funding model. The allocation provides an amount of revenue to a district without regard as to whether the district currently operates a non-credit/CDCP program. It should be noted if a district does NOT currently operate a program it would necessitate roughly 2 years to establish a program working with their local academic senate.

**Legislative Analyst's Office Executive Summary**

**Adult Education Serves Multiple Purposes.** The core mission of adult education is to provide adults with the basic knowledge and skills they need to participate in civic life and the workforce.

Adult education serves undereducated and underskilled state residents who have educational objectives such as learning to speak English; passing the oral and written exams for U.S. citizenship; earning a high school diploma; receiving job training; and obtaining proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics to succeed in collegiate coursework. Under state law, adult education also can serve various other purposes, including offering enrichment classes (such as ceramics) to older adults and providing instruction in effective parenting techniques.

***Adult Schools and Community Colleges Are the State's Main Adult Education Providers.***

Adult schools, which are operated by school districts, and the California Community Colleges (CCC) are the state's primary providers of adult education. Adult schools were the first providers of adult education in the state. Later, the Legislature authorized community colleges (then called "junior colleges") to provide adult education in addition to their traditional mission of instruction at the lower-division (freshman and sophomore) collegiate level.

***Responsibility for Adult Education Unclear for Decades.*** In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Legislature transferred statewide governance of community colleges from the State Board of Education to the CCC Board of Governors. This split raised the question of which segment—school districts or community colleges—should have responsibility for providing adult education in the state. Despite a subsequent lawsuit between schools districts and community colleges and numerous attempts by the state to clarify their respective roles, more than 40 years later the issue remains unresolved.

***Adult Education Suffers From Several Other Shortcomings.*** In addition to unclear lines of responsibility, we find the state's adult education system suffers from a number of other problems, including: (1) an overly broad mission; (2) lack of clear delineations between precollegiate (adult education) and collegiate coursework at CCC; (3) inconsistent state-level policies; (4) widespread lack of coordination among providers; and (5) limited student data, which impairs the public's ability to hold the system accountable for performance. Over the past few years, the role of adult education in California has become even more clouded, as the Legislature has allowed school districts to use for any educational purpose General Fund monies that previously had been dedicated to adult education. As a result of all these issues, adult education in California today is a complex, confusing, and incoherent system.

***Adult Education Is in Need of Comprehensive Restructuring.*** Given adult education's numerous and significant challenges, we believe the system is in need of comprehensive restructuring. In our view, the Legislature has an important role in guiding the development of such a new system. This report lays out a vision and roadmap for a more focused, rational, collaborative, responsive, and accountable system.

***Proposed New System Builds Upon the Relative Strengths of Adult Schools and Community Colleges.*** We find that community colleges and adult schools each have comparative advantages for delivering adult education. The 112 colleges that make up the CCC system focus on adult learners almost exclusively and provide a continuum of education and training through the sophomore year of college. Adult schools, meanwhile, are spread even more widely across the state (even with recent budget cuts, there are about 300 adult schools). They also often provide instruction that is very accessible to adults. For example, some adult education programs are run at elementary schools, such that parents can take classes at the same time and location as their children.

Though comparative data on student outcomes are limited, research suggests that adult schools and community colleges perform equally well at educating adult learners. The new system we recommend takes these factors into account and builds upon the strengths of each provider.

***Recommend Package of Fiscal and Policy Changes.*** The figure below compares the existing system with the new system we recommend. Given that the state's current adult education system is both complex and riddled with serious shortcomings, we recommend the Legislature get started immediately in moving toward a better system—particularly as the transition to a better system likely will entail many steps and take several years to implement fully. By taking at least a few steps now, the foundation for a more efficient and effective system would be in place in the event that the state has new funds to invest in adult education in future years.

**Restructuring the State's Adult Education System**

***Current System vs. New System Under LAO Plan***

- Authorizes ten state-supported instructional programs that serve various purposes vs. Focuses on the six instructional programs most closely aligned with adult education's core mission.
- Lacks a clear and consistent distinction between adult education and collegiate instruction vs. Clearly distinguishes between adult education and collegiate education.
- Applies inconsistent and conflicting policies regarding faculty qualifications, fees, and student assessments at adult schools and community colleges vs. Applies a consistent set of policies for faculty and students at adult schools and community colleges.
- Misses opportunities to create strong collaborations between adult schools and community colleges. vs. Creates a funding mechanism for adult education that promotes a coordinated system centered around student access and success.
- Fails to collect key data needed to fully evaluate the effectiveness of the adult education system. vs. Collects same data on student enrollment and outcomes for both adult schools and community colleges. Links the respective data systems.

### Little Hoover Commission – February 2012

**Recommendation 5: The California Community College system should administer all of the state's adult basic education programs, and the state should shift responsibility and funding for Adult Education to the community colleges.**

- Using the successes in several community college districts, including San Diego and San Francisco, the community colleges should offer adult basic education programs and provide clear and accessible pathways for students to transfer into community college credit academic and career technical education programs.
- The state should increase the funding allocated to the California Community Colleges to reflect this additional responsibility. The amount of the increase should be proportional and equitable to the amount the state currently earmarks for Adult Schools in K-12 school districts. The community colleges should be required to use this new money to support adult basic education programs

### San Diego Community College District -- March 2013

On March 14, 2013, Chancellor Constance Carroll of the San Diego Community College District distributed her district's position on the governor's adult education proposal:

1. **Long-term Goal with Flexibility.** While we do believe that community colleges are the best providers of education for postsecondary-age students and would be the best providers of Adult Education, a change of this type should be a long-term goal, since the ramp-up to a full range of Adult Education programs take time, thoughtful planning, careful negotiation with local school districts, and adequate funding. These are no small matters. Also, the diversity of California's counties and regions is immense, so that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be in the best interest of all community college districts and their K-12 partners in this regard. We recommend that the proposed change include provisions for community colleges to contract-out with their local K-12 districts as one of the options for assuming responsibility for providing Adult Education courses, programs, and services.
2. **Allocation of the \$300 Million in the Governor's Proposal.** The governor has proposed an allocation of \$300 million to fund the change in responsibility for Adult Education. We think it is always a plus to include funding with any new mandate. However, we believe this proposal is in need of focus, since currently the goals for the change in Adult Education are very broad, and \$300 million would not be enough support for community colleges to replicate even the five areas that would remain as authorized categories of Adult Education FTES. We recommend that this funding be focused on the key areas that are most needed at this time: Basic Skills and ESL. Some of the funding could even be set aside to assist districts in their negotiations with K-12 districts.
3. **Allocation System.** We believe that the best, most straightforward allocation would be to districts on the basis of current FTES. The allocation should be at the enhanced (CDCP) FTES rate in view of the types of courses that would be offered.
4. **Faculty and Staff.** As K-12 districts continue to divest themselves of their Adult Education programs, pressure has been mounting on community college districts to hire the faculty and staff who are being laid off. It is important to note that the Adult Education reductions that have been and are being made have no relationship to the governor's proposal and should not be even considered in that light. These reductions reflect K-12 priorities for their budgets following cutbacks by the state. Whether or not the faculty or staff who have been laid off are hired by community colleges should be entirely up to the community colleges based upon positions available and the hiring practices followed to fill them.
5. **Funding Categories.** Part of the proposal being discussed includes the elimination of 4 of the traditional FTES categories in Adult Education. The Statewide Student Success Task Force addressed this same issue and, after over a year of thoughtful review, came to the conclusion that this should not be done. Instead, the Task Force encouraged local districts to prioritize and base local funding determinations on these priorities. To quote from the report's Recommendation 4.1: "Highest priority for course offerings shall be given to credit and noncredit courses that advance students' academic progress in the areas of basic skills, ESL, CTE, degree and certificate attainment, and transfer, in the context of labor market and economic development needs of the community . . . develop appropriate systems of assessment, metrics, goals, and reports addressing student success and student completion in all categories of community college noncredit and/or adult education, including Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) and other noncredit programs and courses that are part of a noncredit student's educational plan." This is a large agenda already, and we believe that districts should continue their work on this before any new changes are made in noncredit funding authorization.

[AdultNonCreditEd.pdf \(215 KB\)](#)



# ADULT/NON-CREDIT EDUCATION

## *Current Law, Governor's Proposal and Community College Response*

*Community College League of California*

### CURRENT LAW

Community college adult education classes are provided on both a non-credit and a credit basis, with *three (3)* different funding rates for courses. For 2012–13, these per-student rates are:

- **Credit Courses:** \$ 4,565
- **Enhanced Non-Credit** (also called CDCP or career development and college preparation): \$3,232
- **Regular Non-Credit:** \$ 2,745

### GOVERNOR'S/DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE (DOF) PROPOSAL

Defund Non-Credit (NC) and Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) and fund adult education as a categorical program with \$300 million in funding. The proposal would *only* fund credit FTES in the main apportionment item.

### COMMUNITY COLLEGE RESPONSE

Reject the defunding of NC and CDCP classes and the DOF's alternative proposal that these classes be funded as a categorical program because both these types of courses are part of the core community college mission, as follows:

Education Code §66010.4 "(a)(2)...In addition to the primary missions...the community colleges shall offer instruction and courses to achieve all of the following:

- (A) The provision of remedial instruction for those in need of it and, in conjunction with school districts, instruction in English as a second language, adult non-credit instruction...are reaffirmed and supported as essential and important functions for the community colleges.
- (B) The provision of adult non-credit education curricula in areas defined as being in the state's interest is an essential and important function of the community colleges...."

In addition, the change from general apportionment to categorical funding would mean that districts that currently serve the largest numbers of students in non-credit and CDCP programs would face great instability because they would have to replace the adult education students (who would move under the categorical funding umbrella) with credit FTES to retain their base apportionment. This would be very difficult to do in such a short time frame and would be especially punitive for the ten districts (Allan Hancock, Glendale, Merced, Mt. San Antonio, North Orange County, Rancho Santiago, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Sonoma) that serve more than ten percent of their students through non-credit/CDCP courses. Specifically, the amount of revenue that these districts can earn under the proposed DOF block grant distribution will be less than the amount each district earned in prior years for their non-credit and CDCP workload. The loss of funding for non-credit/CDCP courses would likely drive these districts into budget stability (i.e., funded for their student losses for one year only), after which they would face significant challenges to restore their current enrollment caps. And these districts may be unable to earn enrollment restoration/growth revenues even if the state budget makes these resources available because the districts would not have sufficient time to replace non-credit FTES with regular credit students.

- CONTINUED ON BACK -



Statewide defunding of non-credit and CDCP classes will leave a roughly \$200 million “hole” in the apportionment (amount of funded non-credit/CDCP as of the 2011-12 recalculation) on the expectation that it will be replaced with credit FTES. The administration proposes to have the apportionment *only* fund credit FTES and shifts the adult education workload (non-credit & CDCP FTES) to a \$300 million adult education block grant. Thus, the “true” amount of new adult education (non-credit & CDCP) resources to the system is really \$100 million ( $\$300\text{m} - \$200\text{m} = \$100\text{million}$ ). *However*, the proposed allocation mechanism for the new adult education block grant *redistributes* the revenue in an inequitable manner.

An additional concern is that categorical block grant funding for a mission component would not include a mechanism for growth or COLA.

We reject the concept of moving all pre-collegiate credit FTES to the enhanced non-credit rate. Currently community college districts are the lowest funded per FTES/ADA education segment in the state. It is nonsensical for the state to spend the lowest amount of funding on one of the most difficult-to-serve populations. For example, K-12 programmatic funding in 2011/12 was roughly \$7,500 per ADA while the community colleges programmatic funding in that same year was roughly \$5,300 per FTES. Over the last 4 years, community colleges have turned away roughly 500,000 students, and prioritized enrollment in transfer, basic skills, and workforce training. Over the same period of time, the colleges have shed lower priority enrollments and achieved greater efficiencies in all operational areas. Community colleges struggle to balance high-cost (i.e., career technical education) programs with low-cost programs (such as psychology, sociology, economics, etc.) and a proposal to fund pre-collegiate credit FTES at a lower rate would damage the ability of our community college districts to focus on CTE and other primary missions.

Districts	Funded CR FTES	Funded NC FTES	Funded CDCP FTES	Total Funded FTES	NC as a % of Total FTES	NC and CDCP as a % of Total FTES	Allocation based upon Funded CR FTES	Allocation based upon Funded FTES	Difference	Non-Credit Revenue	CDCP Revenue	2011-12 P2 NC/CDCP Revenue allocation	Difference 11/12 P2 vs. Gov Prop	Difference TOTAL FUNDED P2 FTES vs. Gov Prop
	4565									2,745	3,232			
Antelope Valley	10,497.09	-	-	10,497.09	-	0.00%	3,049,414	2,864,223	(185,190)	-	-	-	3,049,414	2,864,223
Ohlone	7,695.84	-	-	7,695.84	-	0.00%	2,235,650	2,099,879	(135,771)	-	-	-	2,235,650	2,099,879
Solano	8,500.40	1.48	-	8,501.88	0.00	0.02%	2,469,373	2,319,813	(149,561)	4,063	-	4,063	2,465,311	2,315,750
Redwoods	4,532.86	2.30	-	4,535.16	0.00	0.05%	1,316,800	1,237,459	(79,341)	6,314	-	6,314	1,310,487	1,231,145
Los Rios	48,141.18	27.00	-	48,168.18	0.00	0.06%	13,985,060	13,143,117	(841,943)	74,115	-	74,115	13,910,945	13,069,002
El Camino	17,936.39	14.03	-	17,950.42	0.00	0.08%	5,210,538	4,897,931	(312,607)	38,510	-	38,510	5,172,028	4,859,421
San Bernardino	13,051.33	17.99	-	13,069.32	0.00	0.14%	3,791,425	3,566,081	(225,343)	49,385	-	49,385	3,742,039	3,516,696
Kern	18,173.38	45.72	-	18,219.09	0.00	0.25%	5,279,384	4,971,242	(308,141)	125,496	-	125,496	5,153,888	4,845,746
Hartnell	6,442.53	22.44	-	6,464.97	0.00	0.35%	1,871,561	1,764,025	(107,535)	61,609	-	61,609	1,809,952	1,702,417
Contra Costa	27,674.94	107.59	-	27,782.53	0.00	0.39%	8,039,599	7,580,712	(458,886)	295,335	-	295,335	7,744,264	7,285,378
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	16,738.65	65.08	-	16,803.73	0.00	0.39%	4,862,594	4,585,047	(277,547)	178,645	-	178,645	4,683,950	4,406,403
Riverside	24,737.57	106.97	-	24,844.54	0.00	0.43%	7,186,288	6,779,055	(407,233)	293,644	-	293,644	6,892,644	6,485,411
Compton	5,961.98	26.86	-	5,988.84	0.00	0.45%	1,731,961	1,634,108	(97,853)	73,731	-	73,731	1,658,230	1,560,377
Peralta	17,906.78	99.28	-	18,006.06	0.01	0.55%	5,201,938	4,913,115	(288,823)	272,524	-	272,524	4,929,414	4,640,591
Chabot-Las Positas	15,799.56	89.14	-	15,888.70	0.01	0.56%	4,589,789	4,335,375	(254,414)	244,689	-	244,689	4,345,100	4,090,685
San Jose-Evergreen	13,814.97	78.25	-	13,893.22	0.01	0.56%	4,013,263	3,790,890	(222,373)	214,802	-	214,802	3,798,461	3,576,088
Palo Verde	1,374.85	8.11	-	1,382.96	0.01	0.59%	399,395	377,353	(22,042)	377,133	-	377,133	22,262	355,091
San Mateo	19,366.53	115.68	-	19,482.21	0.01	0.59%	5,625,996	5,315,895	(310,101)	317,542	-	317,542	5,308,455	4,998,353
Lassen	1,816.37	14.07	-	1,830.44	0.01	0.77%	527,656	499,451	(28,205)	38,622	-	38,622	489,034	460,828
Ventura	24,200.33	190.51	-	24,390.84	0.01	0.78%	7,030,220	6,655,258	(374,962)	522,950	-	522,950	6,507,270	6,132,308
Foothill-DeAnza	29,216.21	218.38	11.73	29,446.32	0.01	0.78%	8,487,338	8,034,691	(452,647)	599,453	37,908	637,361	7,849,977	7,397,330
San Joaquin Delta	14,878.39	125.33	-	15,003.72	0.01	0.84%	4,322,188	4,093,898	(228,290)	344,017	-	344,017	3,978,171	3,749,881
Imperial	6,062.81	46.28	10.41	6,119.50	0.01	0.93%	1,761,252	1,669,760	(91,492)	127,039	33,645	160,684	1,600,569	1,509,076
Coast	32,125.69	323.23	-	32,448.92	0.01	1.00%	9,332,546	8,853,978	(478,568)	887,266	-	887,266	8,445,279	7,966,712
Long Beach	19,121.87	113.76	96.10	19,331.73	0.01	1.09%	5,554,921	5,274,834	(280,087)	312,271	310,595	622,866	4,932,055	4,651,968
Victor Valley	8,780.98	114.76	-	8,895.74	0.01	1.29%	2,550,884	2,427,282	(123,601)	315,016	-	315,016	2,235,867	2,112,266
Yosemite	15,745.37	112.68	113.09	15,971.14	0.01	1.41%	4,574,045	4,357,867	(216,178)	309,307	365,507	674,813	3,899,231	3,683,054
State Center	24,869.25	366.55	-	25,235.79	0.01	1.45%	7,224,540	6,885,811	(338,729)	1,006,172	-	1,006,172	6,218,369	5,879,639
Cerritos	15,522.46	75.18	162.16	15,759.80	0.00	1.51%	4,509,290	4,300,202	(209,088)	206,369	524,101	730,470	3,778,820	3,569,732
Yuba	7,301.87	120.29	-	7,422.16	0.02	1.62%	2,121,201	2,025,203	(95,998)	330,196	-	330,196	1,791,005	1,695,007
San Luis Obispo	8,483.15	91.45	53.96	8,628.56	0.01	1.69%	2,464,363	2,354,379	(109,984)	251,030	174,399	425,429	2,038,934	1,928,950
Cabrillo	10,517.00	196.90	-	10,713.90	0.02	1.84%	3,055,198	2,923,382	(131,816)	540,491	-	540,491	2,514,708	2,382,892
Copper Mt.	1,504.88	33.00	2.08	1,539.96	0.02	2.28%	437,168	420,191	(16,977)	90,585	6,723	97,308	339,860	322,883
Sequoias	8,065.58	171.55	24.00	8,261.13	0.02	2.37%	2,343,059	2,254,123	(88,935)	470,902	77,578	548,480	1,794,579	1,705,644
Southwestern	14,274.78	303.20	43.35	14,621.33	0.02	2.37%	4,146,837	3,989,559	(157,277)	832,284	140,107	972,391	3,174,445	3,017,168
Santa Clarita	13,660.78	177.82	157.96	13,996.56	0.01	2.40%	3,968,470	3,819,086	(149,384)	488,116	510,527	998,643	2,969,828	2,820,444
West Kern	2,418.43	60.28	-	2,478.71	0.02	2.43%	702,556	676,338	(26,218)	165,469	-	165,469	537,088	510,870
Chaffey	13,065.55	335.07	-	13,400.62	0.03	2.50%	3,795,556	3,656,480	(139,077)	919,767	-	919,767	2,875,789	2,736,712
Sierra	14,030.39	373.08	-	14,403.46	0.03	2.59%	4,075,842	3,930,114	(145,728)	1,024,094	-	1,024,094	3,051,748	2,906,020
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	6,972.20	191.22	-	7,163.42	0.03	2.67%	2,025,431	1,954,603	(70,828)	524,902	-	524,902	1,500,529	1,429,702
Santa Monica	19,789.67	447.65	125.43	20,362.75	0.02	2.81%	5,748,920	5,556,159	(192,761)	1,228,807	405,380	1,634,188	4,114,732	3,921,972
Barstow	2,298.04	66.58	-	2,364.62	0.03	2.82%	667,582	645,207	(22,375)	182,762	-	182,762	484,820	462,445
Feather River	1,574.12	49.79	-	1,623.91	0.03	3.07%	457,283	443,098	(14,185)	136,674	-	136,674	320,610	306,425
West Valley-Mission	15,599.69	499.75	-	16,099.44	0.03	3.10%	4,531,725	4,392,875	(138,850)	1,371,814	-	1,371,814	3,159,911	3,021,061
Mendocino-Lake	2,584.51	34.26	51.39	2,670.16	0.01	3.21%	750,803	728,577	(22,226)	94,044	166,092	260,136	667,004	468,441
Lake Tahoe	1,812.08	48.75	23.43	1,884.26	0.03	3.83%	526,411	514,137	(12,274)	133,819	75,726	209,545	316,867	304,593
Mt. San Jacinto	9,308.58	268.12	111.31	9,688.01	0.03	3.92%	2,704,153	2,643,459	(60,694)	735,976	359,741	1,095,717	1,608,436	1,547,742
Siskiyou	2,065.07	85.35	-	2,150.42	0.04	3.97%	599,905	586,761	(13,144)	234,286	-	234,286	365,619	352,476
Citrus	10,149.89	401.34	28.00	10,579.23	0.04	4.06%	2,948,552	2,886,636	(61,916)	1,101,678	90,496	1,192,174	1,756,377	1,694,462
Rio Hondo	11,686.23	478.76	68.20	12,233.19	0.04	4.47%	3,394,861	3,337,934	(56,926)	1,314,196	220,422	1,534,619	1,860,242	1,803,316
Palomar	17,454.99	286.45	550.28	18,291.72	0.02	4.57%	5,070,692	4,991,059	(79,633)	786,300	1,778,505	2,564,805	2,505,887	2,426,254
Marin	4,779.86	235.60	-	5,015.46	0.05	4.70%	1,388,554	1,368,513	(20,041)	646,722	-	646,722	741,832	721,791
Napa Valley	5,054.25	238.89	16.13	5,309.27	0.04	4.80%	1,468,266	1,448,683	(19,583)	655,753	52,132	707,885	740,381	740,798
Los Angeles	90,878.52	2,899.98	2,174.61	95,953.11	0.03	5.29%	26,400,300	26,181,662	(218,638)	7,960,434	7,028,349	14,988,783	11,411,517	11,192,878

Districts	Funded CR FTES	Funded NC FTES	Funded CDCP FTES	Total Funded FTES	NC as a % of Total FTES	NC and CDCP as a % of Total FTES	Allocation based upon Funded CR FTES	Allocation based upon Funded FTES	Difference	Non-Credit Revenue	CDCP Revenue	2011-12 P2 NC/CDCP Revenue allocation	Difference 11/12 P2 vs. Gov Prop	Difference TOTAL FUNDED P2 FTES vs. Gov Prop
	4565									2,745	3,232			
Pasadena Area	19,454.33	295.70	895.81	20,645.83	0.01	5.77%	5,651,501	5,633,399	(18,102)	811,697	2,895,242	3,706,938	1,944,562	1,926,461
South Orange	26,063.69	1,583.65	160.23	27,807.57	0.06	6.27%	7,571,528	7,587,544	16,016	4,347,119	517,863	4,864,983	2,706,545	2,722,561
Desert	6,791.82	149.57	323.96	7,265.35	0.02	6.52%	1,973,031	1,982,416	9,385	410,570	1,047,039	1,457,608	515,423	524,808
Mira Costa	9,640.08	790.35	-	10,430.43	0.08	7.58%	2,800,454	2,846,037	45,583	2,169,511	-	2,169,511	630,943	676,526
Monterey Peninsula	6,242.08	521.64	41.50	6,805.22	0.08	8.28%	1,813,330	1,856,865	43,535	1,431,902	134,128	1,566,030	247,301	290,835
West Hills	4,325.65	409.68	-	4,735.33	0.09	8.65%	1,256,604	1,292,076	35,471	1,124,572	-	1,124,572	132,033	167,504
Butte	9,774.85	955.90	42.95	10,773.70	0.09	9.27%	2,839,604	2,939,699	100,095	2,623,943	138,798	2,762,741	76,863	176,958
Allan Hancock	8,126.53	588.48	322.96	9,037.97	0.07	10.08%	2,360,765	2,466,091	105,326	1,615,378	1,043,807	2,659,184	(298,419)	(193,094)
Merced	8,155.02	319.88	677.77	9,152.67	0.03	10.90%	2,369,040	2,497,386	128,346	878,071	2,190,553	3,068,623	(699,583)	(571,237)
Gavilan	4,415.82	491.31	72.22	4,979.35	0.10	11.32%	1,282,801	1,358,661	75,860	1,348,646	233,415	1,582,061	(299,260)	(223,400)
Santa Barbara	12,743.30	1,082.77	689.08	14,515.15	0.07	12.21%	3,701,940	3,960,587	258,647	2,972,204	2,227,107	5,199,310	(1,497,370)	(1,238,723)
Sonoma	16,539.57	2,143.78	510.83	19,194.18	0.11	13.83%	4,804,760	5,237,302	432,542	5,884,676	1,651,003	7,535,679	(2,730,918)	(2,298,376)
Glendale	12,194.25	363.83	2,194.57	14,752.65	0.02	17.34%	3,542,441	4,025,392	482,951	998,716	7,092,850	8,091,566	(4,549,125)	(4,066,174)
North Orange County	26,053.13	3,282.88	2,752.49	32,088.50	0.10	18.81%	7,568,461	8,755,633	1,187,172	9,011,506	8,896,032	17,907,537	(10,339,076)	(9,151,904)
Mt. San Antonio	22,456.52	1,937.57	3,409.29	27,803.38	0.07	19.23%	6,523,643	7,586,401	1,062,759	5,318,630	11,018,825	16,337,455	(9,813,812)	(8,751,054)
San Diego	30,448.28	2,111.77	6,114.35	38,674.40	0.05	21.27%	8,845,254	10,552,654	1,707,400	5,796,809	19,761,579	25,558,388	(16,713,133)	(15,005,734)
Rancho Santiago	20,755.14	365.42	6,590.85	27,711.41	0.01	25.10%	6,029,389	7,561,305	1,531,917	1,003,078	21,301,627	22,304,705	(16,275,316)	(14,743,400)
San Francisco	22,502.02	2,935.55	7,194.60	32,632.17	0.09	31.04%	6,536,859	8,903,979	2,367,120	8,058,085	23,252,947	31,311,032	(24,774,173)	(22,407,053)
	1,032,698.71	30,953.50	35,817.06	1,099,469.27			300,000,000	300,000,000	(0)	84,967,352	115,760,748	200,728,100	99,271,900	99,271,900
	Equalize to CR rate	1,820	1,333											
Adult Ed Categorical Program		56,335,366	47,744,145	104,079,511										
300,000,000	Equalize to CDCP rate	487												
1,032,698.71		15,074,354												
291														
300,000,000														
1,099,469.27														
273														

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
2012-13 FIRST PRINCIPAL APPORTIONMENT  
RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

EXHIBIT C

Workload measures:	Base Funding	Marginal Funding	Base FTES	Workload Restoration FTES	Growth FTES	Restored FTES	Stability FTES	Total Funded FTES	Unfunded FTES	Actual FTES
Credit FTES	4,564,825,083	0,000,000	20,755,140	302,890	0,000	309,689	0,000	21,367,720	673,310	22,041,030
Noncredit FTES	2,744,957,800	2,744,957,800	365,420	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	291,990	0,000	291,990
Noncredit - CDCP FTES	3,232,067,600	3,232,067,600	6,590,850	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	6,161,640	0,000	6,161,640
<b>Total FTES:</b>			<b>27,711,410</b>	<b>302,890</b>	<b>0,000</b>	<b>309,689</b>	<b>0,000</b>	<b>27,821,350</b>	<b>673,310</b>	<b>28,494,660</b>

**I Base Revenues +/- Restore or Decline**

A Basic Allocation		\$9,964,636
B Basic FTEs Revenue Before Workload Reduction	\$117,048,720	
C Workload Reduction	\$0	
D Revised Base FTEs Revenue		\$117,048,720
1 Credit Base Revenue	\$94,743,565	
2 Noncredit Base Revenue	\$1,003,062	
3 Career Development College NonCr	\$21,302,073	
E Current Year Decline		\$0
<b>Total Base Revenue Less Decline</b>		<b>\$127,013,356</b>

**V Other Revenues Adjustments**

A Revenue Adjustment	\$0
<b>Total Revenue Adjustments</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**VI Stability Adjustment**

VI Total Computational Revenue (sum of II, III, IV, V, & VI)	\$129,809,675
--	---------------

**II Inflation Adjustment**

A Statewide Inflation Adjustment	0%
B Inflation Adjustment	\$0
<b>C Current Year Base Revenue + Inflation Adjustment</b>	<b>\$127,013,356</b>

**III Basic Allocation & Restoration**

A Basic Allocation Adjustment	\$0
B Basic Allocation Adjustment COLA	\$0
C Stability Restoration	\$1,413,678
D Restoration of Prior Year Workload Reduction	\$1,382,641
<b>Total Basic Allocation &amp; Restoration</b>	<b>\$2,796,319</b>

**VIII District Revenue Source**

A1 Property Taxes	\$44,770,817	42,754,525
A2 Less Property Taxes Excess	\$0	
B Student Enrollment Fees	\$8,146,704	7,419,246
C State General Apportionment	\$47,497,118	
D June Estimated EPA	\$20,866,081	
E Revenue Shortfall	\$0,934,296,613	77,439,142
<b>Total Available General Revenue</b>	<b>\$129,809,675</b>	<b>127,517,913</b>

**IX Other Allowances and Total Apportionments**

A State General Apportionment	\$47,497,118
B Statewide Average Replacement Cost	\$4,565
Number of Faculty Not Hired	0,000
Full-time Faculty Adjustment	\$0
<b>Net State General Apportionment</b>	<b>\$47,497,118</b>

**X Unrestored Decline as of July 1st of Current Year**

A 1st Year	\$1,413,678
B 2nd Year	\$0
C 3rd Year	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,413,678</b>

Regular Growth Caps adjusted by a factor of 0.00000000 to match funding.

**Basic Allocation Calculation  
College/Center Base Funding Rates:**

Single College District Funding Rates: Total FTES			Multi-College District Funding Rate: Total FTES			
>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236	Rural	>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236
\$5,535,909	\$4,428,727	\$3,321,545	\$583,591	\$4,428,727	\$3,875,136	\$3,321,545
Single College District - College FTES			Multi-College District - College FTES:			Total Colleges
>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236	Rural	>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236
0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2						2
Revenue:				Total		
>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236	Rural	>18,472	>9,236	<=9,236
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,428,727	\$0	\$3,321,545
						\$7,750,272

State Approved Center: Funding Rates			Total State Approved Centers		Total State Approved Centers Revenue	
1	\$1,107,182		1	\$1,107,182		
Grandfathered or Previously Approved Center: Funding Rates @ FTEs Levels						
>924	>693	>462	>231	<=231		
\$1,107,182	\$830,386	\$553,591	\$276,795	\$138,399		
Number of Grandfathered or Previously Approved Centers: @ Total FTEs			Total Grandfathered or Previously Approved Centers		Total Basic Allocation Revenue	
>924	>693	>462	>231	<=231	1	\$9,964,636
1	0	0	0	0	1	
Grandfathered or Previously Approved Center Revenue:			Total Grandfathered or Approved Center			
>924	>693	>462	>231	<=231		
\$1,107,182	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,107,182	