



The Changing Capital Outlay Program

ACBO – Spring Conference
May 21, 2019

PRESENTED BY: ANN-MARIE GABEL – VICE CHANCELLOR, BUSINESS SERVICES, SOCCCD
TIM FLOOD, VICE PRESIDENT, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, MIRA COSTA CCD
CARLOS MONTOYA – DIRECTOR, FACILITIES PLANNING AND UTILIZATION, CO

Learning Objectives – The Changing Capital Outlay Program

- ▶ Rationale for a Change
- ▶ Where have we been
- ▶ Where are we now
- ▶ Next Steps
- ▶ Questions/Feedback

Rationale for a 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

Rationale for a Change

- ▶ ACBO Facilities Taskforce's Goals:
 - 1) Keep process objective, equitable and attainable for all districts
 - 2) Tie into *Vision for Success* where it makes sense

Where have we been

- ▶ September 2018 – Tasked with creating new funding criteria
- ▶ September 2018 – 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

Where have we been – September 2018

Category	Description	Current Funding	Proposed Funding
Funding for Category A			
A	Fire Life-Safety	50%	50%
Distribution of Remaining Funds			
B	Increase Instructional Capacity	50%	25%
C	Modernize Instructional Space	25%	35%
D	Complete Campus Concept	15%	10%
E	Increase Institutional Support Services Capacity	5%	10%
F	Modernize Institutional Support Services Space	5%	20%

Where have we been – October 2018

Category	Description	Current Funding	Option 1 Age	Option 2 Investment	Option 3 Funding
Funding for Category A					
A	Fire Life-Safety	50% of total	50% of total	50% of total	50% of total
Distribution of Remaining Funds					
B	Increase Instructional Capacity	50%	20%	20%	20%
C	Modernize Instructional Space	25%	35%	40%	25%
D	Complete Campus Concept	15%	10%	0	10%
E	Increase Institutional Support Services Capacity	5%	15%	20%	20%
F	Modernize Institutional Support Services Space	5%	20%	20%	25%

Where have we been – December 2018

Category	Description	Current Funding	Proposed Funding
Funding for Category A			
A	Fire Life-Safety	50%	50%
Distribution of Remaining Funds			
B	Increase Instructional Capacity	50%	20%
C	Modernize Instructional Space	25%	25%
D	Complete Campus Concept	15%	10%
E	Increase Institutional Support Services Capacity	5%	20%
F	Modernize Institutional Support Services Space	5%	25%

Where have we been – December 2018

Category B and E	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, therefore the more points you get	50	25
ASF Change	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type.	50	25
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, AB 540 Students and Regions of Low Performance	0	50
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	50	50
	Total	200	200

Where have we been – December 2018

Category C and F	Description	Current Points	Proposed Points
Age of Project Building	This factor provides priority to older facilities that have a greater need for program space renovations. (0 points for buildings under 5 years old; 2 points earned for each year thereafter with a maximum of 120 points)	120	50
Activates Unused Space	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, therefore the more points you get	30	0
Program Changes	Room type changes (20 points); TOP code changes (20 points); Activates unused space (10 points)	0	50
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, AB 540 Students and Regions of Low Performance	0	50
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	50	50
	Total	200	200

Where have we been – December 2018

Category D	Description	Current Points	Proposed Points
Age of Site	This calculation gives priority to older campuses that have a need to develop into a full service campus. (1 point for each year in excess of 10 years of age)	50	50
Programs Services	Priority is given to project to: bring new course offerings to the campus (20 points); provide a degree (20 points); and meet enrollment needs or code requirements (10 points)	50	25
Project Design	A project to: replace temporary facility (50 points): OR replace inadequate facility (30 points); OR expand or add a facility (20 points)	50	25
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, AB 540 Students and Regions of Low Performance	0	50
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	50	50
	Total	200	200

Where have we been – December 2018

Single Category	Description	Current Points	Proposed Points
Growth Funding Formula	This factor uses the apportionment growth formula and assigns a point value based on percentages.	0	20
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	0	20
Age of Site	The calculation gives priority to older campuses that have a need to develop into a full service campus (1 point for each 10 years in excess of 10)	0	10
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, AB 540 Students and Regions of Low Performance	0	100
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	0	50
	Total	0	200

Where have we been – January 2019

Category	Description	Current Funding	Proposed Funding
A	Fire Life-Safety	50%	0%
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%
1	Increase Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	35%
2	Modernize Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	65%

Where have we been – January 2019

Category 1	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	40
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, therefore the more points you get	50	20
GSF Change	Using a normal distribution curve with campus GSF data, ratios are calculated from the system wide total (3, 6, 9, 12, 15 points)	50	15
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	30
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	10
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	10
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	25
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	50	50
Total		200	200

Where have we been – January 2019

Category 2	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 (20 points for 15-24 years old; 40 points for 25 years old or older)	120	40
Critical Infrastructure	Third-party report justifying life, safety, and critical infrastructure needs including: imminent danger to the life or safety of building occupants; seismic deficiencies, and immediate infrastructure failure	0	20
GSF Campus Size	Using a normal distribution curve with campus GSF data, ratios are calculated from the system wide total (3, 6, 9, 12, 15 points)	0	15
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	30
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	10
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	10
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	25
Local Contribution	Possible hardship metric	50	50
Total		200	200

Where have we been – February 2019

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			
1	Increase Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	35%
2	Modernize Instructional and Institutional Support Space	0%	65%

Where have we been – February 2019

Category 1	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	40
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	35
FTES	FTES Scale: 100-249=3 pts; 250-499=6 pts; 500-749=9 pts; 750-999=12 pts; 1000-9999=15 pts; 10000-19999=18 pts; 20000+=20 pts	0	20
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	30
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	15
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	15
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	15
Local Contribution or Hardship	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max Hardship = 25 points	50	50
Total		200	220

Where have we been – February 2019

Category 2	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 (20 points = 15-24 years old; 40 points = 25-39 years old; 55 points = 40 or older)	120	55
Facility Condition Index (FCI)	FCI is from the FUSION assessments	0	20
FTES	FTES Scale: 100-249=3 pts; 250-499=6 pts; 500-749=9 pts; 750-999=12 pts; 1000-9999=15 pts; 10000-19999=18 pts; 20000+=20 pts	0	20
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	30
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	15
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	15
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	15
Local Contribution	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max Hardship = 25 points	50	50
Total		200	220

Where are we now – March 2019

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%

Where are we now – March 2019

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 (20 points for 15-24 years old; 40 points for 25-39 years old or older; 60 points for 40 years and older)	120	60
Facility Condition Index (FCI)	FCI is from the FUSION assessments (start at 5%=1 point; increase 2% points for each point thereafter)	0	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	0	20
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	20
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	10
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	10
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	10
Local Contribution	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max Hardship = 25 points	50	50
Total		200	220

Where are we now – March 2019

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
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	0	20
Vision for Success	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes	0	20
Vision for Success	Supplemental Allocation: Pell Grant Recipients, California College Promise Recipients, and AB 540 Students	0	10
Vision for Success	Student Success Metrics	0	10
Vision for Success	Regions of Low Performance: Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North	0	10
Local Contribution or Hardship	Minimum Local Contribution=25% (25 points) can contribute more for more points up to 50 max Hardship = 25 points	50	50
Total		200	220

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ 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)

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ Three categories:
 - ▶ **A** – Fire, Life, Safety
 - ▶ A-1: Life Safety Projects
 - ▶ A-3: Seismic Retrofit Projects
 - ▶ A-4: Immediate Infrastructure Failure Projects
 - ▶ **M** – Modernization
 - ▶ **G** - Growth

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ 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

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ 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

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ 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
 - ▶ Vision for Success (CTE Programs) – 20 points
 - ▶ Scale: Ratio of CTE Space : Project Space

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ Shared Metrics for Modernization and Growth (continued):
 - ▶ Vision for Success (Supplemental Allocation) – 10 points
 - ▶ Scale: Ratio of All low-income students : Credit student headcount
 - ▶ 0-9% = 1 point
 - ▶ Thereafter 1 point for each range of ten percentage points up to maximum of 10 points for 90% or higher
 - ▶ Vision for Success (Student Success) – 10 points
 - ▶ Scale: Percent change of Total Success Points : Credit student headcount
 - ▶ 0-5% = 1 point
 - ▶ Thereafter 1 point for each range of five percentage points up to a maximum of 10 points for 50% or higher

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ Shared Metrics for Modernization and Growth (continued):
 - ▶ Vision for Success (Regions of Low Performance) – 10 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

Where are we now – March 2019

- ▶ 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 by one of the following:
 - ▶ District made a good faith effort to pass a bond in last 5 years and it failed
 - ▶ Debt level at 70 percent of bonding capacity
 - ▶ Total District bonding capacity less than \$50 million

Where are we now – Were our goals met?

- ▶ ACBO Facilities Taskforce's Goals – Were our goals met?:
 - 1) Keep process objective, equitable and attainable for all districts
 - ▶ **Somewhat**
 - ▶ We attempted to make it as level of a playing field as possible
 - 2) Tie into *Vision for Success* (VSF) where it makes sense
 - ▶ **Mostly**
 - ▶ Collapsing the categories to just three allows us flexibility for shared space
 - ▶ CTE component acknowledges VSF and higher cost of those programs
 - ▶ We can live with “Regions of Low Performance” but don't like it.

Next Steps

- ▶ Seek Board of Governor's approval
- ▶ Roll-out to the field
- ▶ Implement for Final Project Proposals (FPPs) due July 1, 2020 for funding in 2021-22

Questions/Feedback