



CCFC

State Capital Outlay Program Revision – Recategorization and Prioritization

November 10, 2020

Presented by: Ann-Marie Gabel, SOCCCD
Hoang Nguyen, CCCCCO

Agenda

- Rationale for Change
- Where have we been
- Where are we now
- Space Utilization Changes
- Roundtable Discussion



Rationale for Change

- Department of Finance focus has shifted
- Board of Governors requested that all funding be tied to *Vision for Success*
 - Increase by 20% # students receiving degrees
 - Increase by 35% # students transferring to UC or CSU
 - Decrease average # units taken from 87 to 79 units
 - Increase % of CTE students employed in field of study from 60 to 69%
 - Reduce equity gaps across all measures with goal of cutting achievement gaps by 40% in 5 years
 - Reduce regional achievement gaps within 10 years

3

Rationale for Change

ACBO Facilities Advisory Committee's Goals:

1. Keep process objective, equitable and attainable for all districts
2. Tie into *Vision for Success* where it makes sense

4



Where have we been...

- September 2018 – Tasked with creating new funding criteria
 - Proposal to change funding % between categories
- October 2018 – First discussion of collapsing categories into 4
- December 2018 – Proposal to change factors within categories
 - Single category proposed
- January 2019 – Proposal to collapse into 2 categories, new metrics proposed
- February 2019 – Proposal to collapse into 3 categories, new metrics proposed
- March 2019 – Finalized recommendation

5

Where have we been...

- January 2020 – Presented proposal to Department of Finance (DOF)
 - DOF required 25% local contribution and rejected some hardship metrics
- March 2020 – Removed controversial components
- June 2020 – Submitted written request to Department of Finance
- August 2020 – Received Department of Finance approval for changes with the following caveat:
 - Category A-3 projects must be ranked and funded by severity
 - Hardship Waiver – Districts must meet one out of the three scenarios

6



Where are we now...

Three categories:

- **A** – Fire, Life, Safety
 - A-1: Life Safety Projects
 - A-3: Seismic Retrofit Projects
 - These will be ranked and funded by severity of category with Category 6 funded first, then Category 5, then Category 4, and so on
 - A-4: Immediate Infrastructure Failure Projects
- **M** – Modernization
- **G** - Growth

7

Where are we now...

Category	Description	Current Funding	Proposed Funding
Funding for Category A			
A	Fire Life-Safety	50%	50%
B	Increase Instructional Capacity	50%	0%
C	Modernize Instructional Space	25%	0%
D	Complete Campus Concept	15%	0%
E	Increase Institutional Support Services Capacity	5%	0%
F	Modernize Institutional Support Services Space	5%	0%
Distribution of Remaining Funds			
M	Modernize Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	65%
G	Increase Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	35%

8



Where are we now...

- Overall Guidelines
 - Projects must be capacity load eligible
 - Must be in alignment with AB 19 minimum conditions
 - Partner with LEA to establish early commitment to college
 - Partner with LEA to improve student preparation for college
 - Utilize evidence-based assessment and placement practices, including multiple measures
 - Participate in Guided Pathways program
 - Maximize student access to need-based financial aid (i.e. participate in federal student loan program)
 - Effective for FPPs and IPPs submitted July 1, 2021

9

Where are we now...

- **All** categories require **minimum 25% Local contribution** and have Hardship Component
- Hardship = 25 points maximum
 - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues by meeting one of the following:
 - District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project
 - Debt-level of at least 70 percent of bonding capacity (2.5 percent of AV)
 - Total District bonding capacity less than \$50 million

10



Where are we now...

Category M	Description	Current Points	Proposed Points
Age of Project Building	This factor provides priority to facilities 15 years and older that have a greater need for program space renovations. Scale: One point for every year, starts with 15 years equal to 15 points and so forth to 60 years equal 60 points.	120	60
Activates Unused Space	This factor supports renovation of existing space that currently cannot be used but can be activated after the renovation. Activated unused space (050), is at least 5% of total space to be renovated.	30	N/A
Facility Condition Index (FCI)	FCI is from the FUSION assessments (start at 5%=1 point; increase 2% points for each point thereafter: 80% and higher reaches a maximum of 40 points)	New	40
FTES	FTES Scale (per site): 500-999=6 pts; 1,000-9,999=12 pts; 10,000-19,999=16 pts; 20,000+=20 pts	New	20
CTE Programs (Vision for Success)	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	New	25
Regions of High Need (Vision for Success)	Regions of High Need: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	New	5
Local Contribution	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max OR Hardship = 25 points Maximum	50	50
		Total	200

11

Where are we now...

- **Modernization Metrics Used:**
 - **Age of Project Building – 60 points**
 - Scale: One point for every year, starts with 15 years equal to 15 points and so forth to 60 years equal 60 points
 - **Facility condition Index (FCI) – 40 points**
 - Starting with 5% = 1 point
 - then every change in 2% points garners another point up to a total of 40 points for 80% and above

12



Where are we now...

Category G	Description	Current Points	Proposed Points
Enrollment Growth	This factor looks at the campus' enrollment (WSCH) change over a 5-year period; the higher the enrollment increase, the more points you get	50	50
Existing Inventory	This calculation compares the existing space capacity to the enrollment need or load. So, the lower the capacity load ratio, the greater the need for additional space	50	50
Assignable Square Footage (ASF) Change	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type.	50	N/A
FTES	FTES Scale (per site): 500-999=6 pts; 1,000-9,999=12 pts; 10,000-19,999=16 pts; 20,000+=20 pts	New	20
CTE Programs (Vision for Success)	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	New	25
Regions of High Need (Vision for Success)	Regions of High Need: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	New	5
Local Contribution or Hardship	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max OR Hardship = 25 points Maximum	50	50
Total		200	200

13

Where are we now...

- Growth Metrics Used:
 - Enrollment Growth – 50 points
 - Five year change in WSCH eligibility points on a sliding scale
 - 512-1,025 = 1 point
 - Each 512/513 increment thereafter = 1 point up to a maximum of 50 points for 25,615 or greater
 - Existing Inventory – 50 points
 - Percentage of Capacity Load Ratio – the lower the percentage the more points you get

14



Where are we now...

- Shared Metrics for Modernization and Growth:
 - FTES – 20 points
 - 500-999 = 6 points
 - 1,000-9,999 = 12 points
 - 10,000-19,999 = 16 points
 - 20,000+ = 20 points
 - CTE Programs (Vision for Success) – 25 points
 - Scale: Ratio of CTE Space : Project Space

15

Where are we now...

- Shared Metrics for Modernization and Growth (continued):
 - Regions of High Need (Vision for Success) – 5 points
 - Central Valley
 - Kern, Merced, San Joaquin, Sequoias, State Center, West Hills, West Kern
 - Sierras
 - Yosemite
 - Inland Empire
 - Barstow, Chaffey, Copper Mountain, Desert, Mt. San Jacinto, Palo Verde, Riverside, San Bernardino, Victor Valley
 - Far North
 - Mendocino-Lake, Redwoods, Butte-Glenn, Feather River, Lassen, Shasta-Tehama-Trinity, Siskiyou

16



Where are we now...

- Shared Metrics for Modernization and Growth (continued):
 - Local Contribution/Hardship – 50 points
 - Local Contribution = 50 points maximum
 - 25% Minimum Local Contribution required on all projects **AND**
 - 1 point for every percent of local contribution up to 50 percent
 - OR**
 - Hardship = 25 points maximum
 - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following:
 - District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project
 - Debt level at 70 percent of bonding capacity (2.5 percent of AV)
 - Total District bonding capacity less than \$50 million

17

Space Utilization Changes

- Lecture Space:
 - Going from 15 assignable square feet (ASF) to **20 ASF**
 - California Building Code compliancy
- Office Space:
 - Increased office ASF by 25% to meet the needs of Vision For Success

	Current ASF	Revised ASF
Large District	140	175
Small District	160	200

18



Roundtable Discussion