
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

1102 Q STREET

SACRAMENTO, CA 95811-6549

(916) 445-8752

<http://www.cccco.edu>

August 4, 2009

TO: Chief Business Officers
FROM: Erik Skinner, Vice Chancellor College Finance and Facilities Planning
SUBJECT: 2009-10 Workload Adjustments

Assembly Bill X4 1, the recently enacted revision to the *2009-10 Budget Act*, includes a provision authorizing the Chancellor to adjust districts' base workload measures commensurate with reductions in general apportionment revenues. The purpose of this workload adjustment is to align full-time equivalent student (FTES) workload with the reduced revenues provided to districts by the state in the 2009-10 Fiscal Year. Simply put, the workload adjustment provision acknowledges that significant budget cuts will reduce the capacity of community colleges to offer courses and serve students and reduces workload expectations accordingly. Language in Assembly Bill X4 1 states legislative intent that reductions in course sections, to the greatest extent possible, be achieved in areas other than basic skills, workforce training, and transfer.

Consistent with this authority, the Chancellor's Office has calculated **preliminary** reductions to each district's base FTES workload measures for the 2009-10 Fiscal Year. These calculations are shown on the attached spreadsheet. These reductions are preliminary because we do not yet have final 2008-09 district workload measures for funded FTES, stability FTES, and restoration FTES. For now, and until we have final 2008-09 workload measures (which will be available at the 2008-09 recalculation around mid-December) we are basing these reductions on each district's funded FTES reported at the 2008-09 Second Principal Apportionment. Final workload reductions will then be calculated in late December using updated 2008-09 workload data; all other assumptions and inputs to the final calculation will be consistent with the preliminary reductions.

For 2009-10, the state's total funding obligation for all districts equals \$5.861 billion. The State Budget estimates that the community colleges will receive a total of \$5.669 billion from State General Fund Revenues, Property Tax Revenues, Student Fee Revenues, and Oil & Mineral Revenues in 2009-10. The shortfall in revenues compared to funding obligation equals \$192 million or 3.39 percent of general

apportionment revenues. Therefore, for this preliminary workload adjustment the Chancellor's Office has reduced each district's Total Computational Revenue for 2009-10 by 3.39 percent.

Basic Allocations

If a district's FTES workload is reduced to a point where a district falls into a lower funding category for the basic allocation determination (e.g. drops from a medium-sized district to a small district), that district will not experience a reduction in its basic allocation revenue for the first three years starting with the 2009-10 fiscal year and extending to 2011-12. If after the third year a district's actual FTES (as opposed to funded FTES) remains at the lower basic allocation threshold, then that district's basic allocation revenue amount will be reduced accordingly.

Final Workload Reduction Calculations

Final 2008-09 workload information is due to the Chancellor's Office from districts on November 1, 2009. Once we have this final workload data for 2008-09, the Chancellor's Office will recalculate each district's base workload adjustments and make them available to districts in the same format as shown on the attached spreadsheet. We anticipate that the final workload reduction calculations will be completed by mid-December. As noted above, the only variable changing in the final calculations will be the updated 2008-09 workload data.

District Workload Reduction Option

This preliminary workload reduction calculation reduces all three workload measures proportionally based on each district's mix of funded FTES for credit, non-credit, and career development and college preparation as certified at the 2008-09 Second Principal Apportionment. However, when the final workload reductions are calculated in mid-December, a district will have the option of allocating its FTES workload reduction across the three funding categories as it sees fit. That is, a district may choose to reduce FTES disproportionately across the three FTES workload categories (credit, non-credit, and career development and college preparation) as long as the resulting total dollar amount equals the district's specified workload reduction.

In the coming weeks, the Chancellor's Office will make available the necessary forms and guidance to districts wishing to adjust the mix of reductions to the three FTES workload measures. If a district does not choose to exercise this option, the Chancellor's Office will calculate the final workload reductions using the same proportional method used for this preliminary August workload adjustment.

Workload Adjustment Q & A

This information is intended to provide greater clarity on how the workload reduction will work. Given that it is a new and complex topic, there are bound to be many questions about it. Below are some of the most frequently asked questions with the corresponding answers. Please feel free to ask additional questions as needed.

Question 1: I have a question on the 3.39%. Is this cut in addition to the \$120 million reduction that was previously reported? Also, does this reduction factor in any of the estimated property tax shortfall?

Answer 1: The 3.39 percent reduction in workload reflects the entire general apportionment shortfall. It includes:

- \$120 million cut to apportionments (in lieu of cut to physical education funding rates)
- \$53 million property tax shortfall (the total estimated property tax shortfall is \$116 million, but \$63 million in relief is provided in the revised budget)
- \$41 million base shortfall
- \$21 million shortfall in student fee revenues (identified but not backfilled in the budget package)
- Various other technical changes

Question 2: What happens if the property tax or student fee shortfalls grow beyond current estimates?

Answer 2: The workload adjustment language contained in Assembly Bill X4 1 would allow the Chancellor to make further adjustments to workload in the event that the shortfall in general apportionment grows, for instance due to further erosion in property taxes or student fees. However, at this time we are still evaluating if and how we would exercise such authority. The Chancellor's Office will be consulting with ACBO and other stakeholders as we consider how to proceed.

Question 3: Your memo indicates that the workload reduction will be a proportional 3.39 percent reduction to each category (credit, noncredit, career development college prep). The worksheet uses our P-2 FTES numbers for each category but the reductions by category do not equal 3.39 percent, nor does the aggregate reduction in FTES. Why is this?

Answer 3: The 3.39 percent reduction was applied to each district's TCR. Because TCR also includes basic allocations, your reduction in FTES will not equal 3.39 percent. We applied the adjustment in this manner in order to ensure uniform adjustments across all districts. This is also consistent with the workload adjustment provisions that exist in our regulations (Title 5, Section 58772).

Question 4: One of our colleges has exceeded 10,000 FTES (2008-09 annual) and should be getting the differential increase for exceeding this target. With the adjustment in workload, the college will be below the 10,000 threshold. Is the college protected and for how long?

Answer 4: The higher basic allocation will be protected for the current and two subsequent fiscal years. See the excerpt from yesterday's memo:

If a district's FTES workload is reduced to a point where a district falls into a lower funding category for the basic allocation determination (e.g. drops from a medium-sized district to a small district), that district will not experience a reduction in its basic allocation revenue for the first three years starting with the 2009-10 fiscal year and extending to 2011-12. If after the third year a district's actual FTES (as opposed to funded FTES) remains at the lower basic allocation threshold, then that district's basic allocation revenue amount will be reduced accordingly.

Question 5: What impact does the workload adjustment have on restoration. The district has restored all but \$1 million in 2008-09. The district had planned on full restoration in 2009-10. Will we still be able to receive this funding?

Answer 5: A district is entitled to restore all outstanding restoration, as adjusted for the workload reduction. That is, a district's restoration eligibility is reduced by 3.39 percent so as to ensure equitable treatment with non-restoration districts. The district will earn the restoration by exceeding their revised base workload measures. The resources to earn back the outstanding restoration are included in the revised overall statewide total computational revenue figure. If the overall statewide total computation revenue had NOT been adjusted, then the ENTIRE system would have experienced a statewide deficit factor applied to ALL districts as soon as a "restoration" district" began to restore workload.

Question 6: Do you know if our 2009-10 Lottery Funds will be based on the old FTES base or the new FTES base?

Answer 6: Lottery Fund allocations are based on prior-year actual FTES (as opposed to funded FTES). Accordingly, the workload adjustment will have no bearing on lottery allocations. For 2009-10 and future years, what will drive your Lottery Fund allocation is the number of FTES you end up serving.

Question 7: How will this workload adjustment affect my district's Faculty Obligation Number (FON)?

Answer 7: Title 5, Section 51025 (g) specifies that "For districts that experience a reduction in base credit FTES, the Chancellor shall make a proportionate reduction to their base number of full-time faculty." Under this provision, any reduction to a

district's funded credit FTES in 2009-10 would reduce the FON by an equal percentage for Fall 2010. This would be a permanent reduction to the district's FON.

I would further note that Title 5, Section 51025 (c) (7) specifies that "If the Board of Governors determines pursuant to subsection (a) that adequate funds have not been provided to implement paragraph (1), the district's base full-time faculty obligation shall be unchanged. However, for the fall term of the succeeding fiscal year the district may choose, in lieu of maintaining its base obligation, to maintain, at a minimum, the full-time faculty percentage attained in the prior fall term." Given that the Board of Governors has already made the finding of inadequate funds in regard to the 2009-10 year, a district has the option of meeting its 2009-10 full-time faculty requirement by simply maintaining its percentage of full-time faculty from the prior year, even if this represents a number of full-time faculty that is less than the district's FON. Given the severity of cuts in the 2009-10 State Budget, it seems likely that the Board would also rule that the budget contains inadequate funds to support an increase in the FON for fall 2010. This action, if taken by the Board, would then extend this alternative "percentage" option for the 2010-11 year. This provision grants temporary flexibility but does not permanently reduce a district's FON.

2009-10 WORKLOAD REDUCTION DISPLAY

REDUCTION AUTHORITY

Below is the workload reduction language in the *2009-10 Budget Act*, AB 4x-1, which authorizes the Chancellor's Office to make district workload adjustments in the 2009-10 fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chancellor may reduce community college district base workload measures to match available funding under Schedule (1) of item 6870-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2009, which reflects a base reduction of \$120,000,000, and local revenues designated to support community college district general apportionments. It is the intent of the Legislature that community college districts, to the greatest extent possible, shall implement any necessary workload reductions in areas other than basic skills, workforce training, and transfer. On or before March 1, 2010, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall provide the Legislature and Department of Finance with a report on the implementation of this provision.

2009-10 WORKLOAD REDUCTION DISPLAY FTES & TCR BEFORE REDUCTIONS

2008-09 P2 FTES					
DistName	Funded Credit	Funded Non-Credit	Funded CDCP	Total Funded	2008-09 P2 TCR(1)
Allan Hancock	8,597.32	1,028.28	471.50	10,097.10	\$ 49,127,643
Antelope Valley	11,482.60	50.29	-	11,532.89	\$ 57,121,229
Barstow	2,226.67	198.33	-	2,425.00	\$ 14,583,898
Butte	10,435.50	1,401.92	33.03	11,870.45	\$ 56,019,927
Cabrillo	11,509.01	336.72	-	11,845.73	\$ 58,996,818
Cerritos	17,023.33	300.19	-	17,323.52	\$ 82,961,277
Chabot-Las	16,732.99	452.23	-	17,185.22	\$ 84,821,205
Chaffey	14,336.79	504.04	-	14,840.83	\$ 73,471,597
Citrus	10,552.64	1,396.92	24.77	11,974.33	\$ 56,514,237
Coast	35,034.27	614.32	-	35,648.59	\$ 172,683,411
Compton	4,917.15	98.31	-	5,015.46	\$ 26,037,332
Contra Costa	28,248.97	274.23	-	28,523.20	\$ 141,329,767
Copper Mt.	1,508.97	49.85	-	1,558.82	\$ 10,900,157
Desert	7,156.01	103.25	831.06	8,090.32	\$ 38,956,936
El Camino	19,645.90	36.44	-	19,682.34	\$ 99,744,740
Feather River	1,609.60	34.43	-	1,644.03	\$ 11,317,157
Foothill-De	32,780.02	748.73	-	33,528.75	\$ 161,519,545
Gavilan	4,802.23	640.17	48.91	5,491.31	\$ 27,711,807
Glendale	13,276.94	321.34	2,576.42	16,174.70	\$ 75,352,048
Grossmont	17,849.18	901.33	-	18,750.51	\$ 91,149,181
Hartnell	7,072.66	15.71	-	7,088.37	\$ 36,203,711
Imperial	7,091.41	114.26	28.94	7,234.61	\$ 36,099,763
Kern	19,806.73	315.37	0.90	20,123.00	\$ 105,399,832
Lake Tahoe	1,756.05	56.86	56.96	1,869.87	\$ 12,445,160
Lassen	1,542.67	19.68	-	1,562.35	\$ 11,125,874
Long Beach	20,324.67	628.49	576.00	21,529.16	\$ 103,008,503
Los Angeles	99,106.26	4,152.24	2,197.86	105,456.36	\$ 504,119,558
Los Rios	52,342.47	719.10	-	53,061.57	\$ 259,730,230
Marin	4,207.09	210.95	-	4,418.04	\$ 26,711,328
Mendocino	2,903.75	87.88	30.12	3,021.75	\$ 18,022,415
Merced	8,621.56	821.53	811.42	10,254.51	\$ 49,769,467
Mira Costa	8,080.29	1,191.54	-	9,271.83	\$ 45,781,548
Monterey F	6,325.58	1,992.96	-	8,318.54	\$ 37,944,080
Mt. San An	24,145.90	1,494.98	4,909.53	30,550.41	\$ 135,729,310
Mt. San Jac	10,255.34	237.93	123.32	10,616.59	\$ 53,401,431
Napa Valley	5,261.49	907.46	-	6,168.95	\$ 30,660,640
North Orange	27,897.77	4,433.17	3,212.32	35,543.26	\$ 158,757,199
Ohlone	8,403.83	43.29	-	8,447.12	\$ 42,909,571
Palo Verde	1,801.37	104.46	-	1,905.83	\$ 12,523,213

Palomar	18,885.49	457.92	852.00	20,195.41	\$ 96,862,720
Pasadena	21,287.53	525.01	835.85	22,648.39	\$ 107,959,599
Peralta	19,532.52	292.55	-	19,825.07	\$ 103,251,735
Rancho Sa	21,031.19	2,463.66	8,342.31	31,837.16	\$ 138,586,707
Redwoods	5,212.31	2.04	-	5,214.35	\$ 28,504,415
Rio Hondo	12,804.29	575.26	26.94	13,406.49	\$ 64,544,225
Riverside	27,031.95	206.33	-	27,238.28	\$ 131,712,739
San Bernar	14,312.22	6.86	-	14,319.08	\$ 72,548,288
San Diego	32,481.49	3,308.14	7,127.10	42,916.73	\$ 196,996,027
San Franci	25,346.27	4,036.73	8,124.22	37,507.22	\$ 166,925,903
San Joaqui	16,015.34	623.26	-	16,638.60	\$ 79,800,345
San Jose-E	15,175.46	41.14	-	15,216.60	\$ 76,309,255
San Luis O	9,173.09	269.66	94.55	9,537.30	\$ 47,348,058
San Mateo	21,790.26	49.37	-	21,839.63	\$ 109,568,863
Santa Barb	13,502.68	1,660.81	967.39	16,130.88	\$ 75,965,988
Santa Clari	14,954.77	425.80	144.75	15,525.32	\$ 75,438,459
Santa Moni	21,598.57	635.10	108.52	22,342.19	\$ 109,002,081
Sequoias	8,864.16	145.79	30.98	9,040.93	\$ 46,499,587
Shasta-Tel	7,521.61	413.61	-	7,935.22	\$ 38,791,739
Sierra	15,509.43	175.20	-	15,684.63	\$ 76,953,060
Siskiyou	2,455.83	149.78	-	2,605.61	\$ 15,496,710
Solano	9,313.88	-	-	9,313.88	\$ 46,944,964
Sonoma	17,817.50	2,845.12	582.64	21,245.26	\$ 99,053,711
South Orar	23,433.04	2,150.54	155.58	25,739.16	\$ 123,818,093
Southwest	15,384.77	670.24	19.48	16,074.49	\$ 77,667,415
State Cent	27,089.13	729.06	-	27,818.19	\$ 136,730,179
Ventura	26,349.34	497.32	-	26,846.66	\$ 132,717,054
Victor Valle	9,510.81	349.00	-	9,859.81	\$ 48,801,886
West Hills	4,730.65	489.98	-	5,220.63	\$ 29,859,469
West Kern	2,453.64	22.90	-	2,476.54	\$ 19,601,491
West Valley	16,381.18	1,148.05	-	17,529.23	\$ 84,571,661
Yosemite	16,774.35	878.94	166.43	17,819.72	\$ 86,719,231
Yuba	8,061.37	134.51	-	8,195.88	\$ 44,918,248
	1,108,459.10	53,418.86	43,511.80	1,205,389.76	\$ 5,861,132,650

(1) A district's 2009-10 Beginning TCR used in this calculation equals its 2008-09 P2 TCR less 2008-09 stability and increased by any prior year revenue adjustments

2009-10 WORKLOAD REDUCTION DISPLAY FTES REDUCTIONS

District	FTES Reductions				Rebench Base FTES
	Credit	Non-Cr	CDCP	Total	2009-10
Allan Hancock	(310.59)	(61.78)	(24.06)	(396.43)	9,700.67
Antelope Valley	(422.27)	(3.08)	-	(425.35)	11,107.54
Barstow	(99.43)	(14.73)	-	(114.16)	2,310.84
Butte	(365.66)	(81.69)	(1.63)	(448.98)	11,421.47
Cabrillo	(425.59)	(20.71)	-	(446.30)	11,399.43
Cerritos	(605.31)	(17.75)	-	(623.06)	16,700.46
Chabot-Las Positas	(613.22)	(27.56)	-	(640.78)	16,544.44
Chaffey	(526.99)	(30.81)	-	(557.80)	14,283.03
Citrus	(369.79)	(81.41)	(1.23)	(452.43)	11,521.90
Coast	(1,260.06)	(36.74)	-	(1,296.80)	34,351.79
Compton	(189.54)	(6.30)	-	(195.84)	4,819.62
Contra Costa	(1,039.27)	(16.78)	-	(1,056.05)	27,467.15
Copper Mt.	(78.34)	(4.30)	-	(82.64)	1,476.18
Desert	(255.85)	(6.14)	(41.96)	(303.95)	7,786.37
El Camino	(739.22)	(2.28)	-	(741.50)	18,940.84
Feather River	(82.27)	(2.93)	-	(85.20)	1,558.83
Foothill-DeAnza	(1,172.49)	(44.54)	-	(1,217.03)	32,311.72
Gavilan	(179.94)	(39.89)	(2.59)	(222.42)	5,268.89
Glendale	(459.25)	(18.48)	(125.87)	(603.60)	15,571.10
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	(644.24)	(54.10)	-	(698.34)	18,052.17
Hartnell	(268.21)	(0.99)	-	(269.20)	6,819.17
Imperial	(262.73)	(7.04)	(1.51)	(271.28)	6,963.33
Kern	(770.28)	(20.40)	(0.05)	(790.73)	19,332.27
Lake Tahoe	(86.78)	(4.67)	(3.98)	(95.43)	1,774.44
Lassen	(81.57)	(1.73)	-	(83.30)	1,479.05
Long Beach	(722.04)	(37.13)	(28.90)	(788.07)	20,741.09
Los Angeles	(3,517.65)	(245.09)	(110.18)	(3,872.92)	101,583.44
Los Rios	(1,902.34)	(43.46)	-	(1,945.80)	51,115.77
Marin	-	-	-	-	4,418.04
Mendocino-Lake	(128.59)	(6.47)	(1.88)	(136.94)	2,884.81
Merced	(310.69)	(49.23)	(41.30)	(401.22)	9,853.29
Mira Costa	-	-	-	-	9,271.83
Monterey Peninsula	(214.23)	(112.25)	-	(326.48)	7,992.06
Mt. San Antonio	(796.51)	(82.01)	(228.73)	(1,107.25)	29,443.16
Mt. San Jacinto	(383.01)	(14.78)	(6.50)	(404.29)	10,212.30
Napa Valley	(194.16)	(55.69)	-	(249.85)	5,919.10
North Orange County	(925.20)	(244.49)	(150.46)	(1,320.15)	34,223.11
Ohlone	(316.97)	(2.72)	-	(319.69)	8,127.43
Palo Verde	(87.89)	(8.48)	-	(96.37)	1,809.46
Palomar	(672.55)	(27.12)	(42.85)	(742.52)	19,452.89
Pasadena Area	(753.43)	(30.90)	(41.78)	(826.11)	21,822.28
Peralta	(755.32)	(18.81)	-	(774.13)	19,050.94
Rancho Santiago	(679.74)	(132.42)	(380.81)	(1,192.97)	30,644.19
Redwoods	(211.56)	(0.14)	-	(211.70)	5,002.65

District	FTES Reductions				Rebench
	Credit	Non-Cr	CDCP	Total	Base FTES 2009-10
Rio Hondo	(457.71)	(34.20)	(1.36)	(493.27)	12,913.22
Riverside	(970.55)	(12.32)	-	(982.87)	26,255.41
San Bernardino	(538.41)	(0.43)	-	(538.84)	13,780.24
San Diego	(1,107.03)	(187.50)	(343.07)	(1,637.60)	41,279.13
San Francisco	(837.56)	(221.83)	(379.16)	(1,438.55)	36,068.67
San Joaquin Delta	(570.32)	(36.91)	-	(607.23)	16,031.37
San Jose-Evergreen	(565.06)	(2.55)	-	(567.61)	14,648.99
San Luis Obispo	(338.13)	(16.53)	(4.92)	(359.58)	9,177.72
San Mateo	(811.70)	(3.06)	-	(814.76)	21,024.87
Santa Barbara	(472.14)	(96.57)	(47.77)	(616.48)	15,514.40
Santa Clarita	(539.54)	(25.55)	(7.38)	(572.47)	14,952.85
Santa Monica	(782.39)	(38.26)	(5.55)	(826.20)	21,515.99
Sequoias	(338.50)	(9.26)	(1.67)	(349.43)	8,691.50
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	(273.01)	(24.97)	-	(297.98)	7,637.24
Sierra	(564.99)	(10.61)	-	(575.60)	15,109.03
Siskiyou	(108.45)	(11.00)	-	(119.45)	2,486.16
Solano	(348.56)	-	-	(348.56)	8,965.32
Sonoma	(616.80)	(163.79)	(28.49)	(809.08)	20,436.18
South Orange	-	-	-	-	25,739.16
Southwestern	(551.93)	(39.99)	(0.99)	(592.91)	15,481.58
State Center	(988.60)	(44.25)	-	(1,032.85)	26,785.34
Ventura	(967.16)	(30.36)	-	(997.52)	25,849.14
Victor Valley	(349.52)	(21.33)	-	(370.85)	9,488.96
West Hills	(200.90)	(34.60)	-	(235.50)	4,985.13
West Kern	(144.19)	(2.24)	-	(146.43)	2,330.11
West Valley-Mission	(586.81)	(68.39)	-	(655.20)	16,874.03
Yosemite	(606.11)	(52.81)	(8.49)	(667.41)	17,152.31
Yuba	(328.04)	(9.10)	-	(337.14)	7,858.74
	(38,844.88)	(2,916.43)	(2,065.12)	(43,826.43)	1,161,563.33

**NOTE: Credit funding per FTES equals \$4,564.82; Non-credit funding per FTES equals \$2,744.95;
Career development & college preparation funding per FTES equals \$3,232.06**

2009-10 WORKLOAD REDUCTION DISPLAY

REDUCTIONS AND NEW TCR

District	Total Revenue	
	Reduction \$192 million	2009-10 Revised TCR
Allan Hancock	\$ (1,665,102)	\$ 47,462,541
Antelope Valley	\$ (1,936,032)	\$ 55,185,197
Barstow	\$ (494,298)	\$ 14,089,600
Butte	\$ (1,898,705)	\$ 54,121,222
Cabrillo	\$ (1,999,602)	\$ 56,997,216
Cerritos	\$ (2,811,839)	\$ 80,149,438
Chabot-Las Positas	\$ (2,874,878)	\$ 81,946,327
Chaffey	\$ (2,490,201)	\$ 70,981,396
Citrus	\$ (1,915,459)	\$ 54,598,778
Coast	\$ (5,852,826)	\$ 166,830,585
Compton	\$ (882,493)	\$ 25,154,839
Contra Costa	\$ (4,790,145)	\$ 136,539,622
Copper Mt.	\$ (369,443)	\$ 10,530,714
Desert	\$ (1,320,383)	\$ 37,636,553
El Camino	\$ (3,380,687)	\$ 96,364,053
Feather River	\$ (383,577)	\$ 10,933,580
Foothill-DeAnza	\$ (5,474,445)	\$ 156,045,100
Gavilan	\$ (939,247)	\$ 26,772,560
Glendale	\$ (2,553,936)	\$ 72,798,112
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	\$ (3,089,355)	\$ 88,059,826
Hartnell	\$ (1,227,066)	\$ 34,976,645
Imperial	\$ (1,223,543)	\$ 34,876,220
Kern	\$ (3,572,357)	\$ 101,827,475
Lake Tahoe	\$ (421,809)	\$ 12,023,351
Lassen	\$ (377,094)	\$ 10,748,780
Long Beach	\$ (3,491,307)	\$ 99,517,196
Los Angeles	\$ (17,086,320)	\$ 487,033,238
Los Rios	\$ (8,803,137)	\$ 250,927,093
Marin	\$ -	\$ 26,711,328
Mendocino-Lake	\$ (610,841)	\$ 17,411,574
Merced	\$ (1,686,856)	\$ 48,082,611
Mira Costa	\$ -	\$ 45,781,548
Monterey Peninsula	\$ (1,286,053)	\$ 36,658,027
Mt. San Antonio	\$ (4,600,326)	\$ 131,128,984
Mt. San Jacinto	\$ (1,809,955)	\$ 51,591,476
Napa Valley	\$ (1,039,193)	\$ 29,621,447
North Orange County	\$ (5,380,819)	\$ 153,376,380
Ohlone	\$ (1,454,351)	\$ 41,455,220
Palo Verde	\$ (424,454)	\$ 12,098,759

Palomar	\$ (3,283,006)	\$ 93,579,714
Pasadena Area	\$ (3,659,117)	\$ 104,300,482
Peralta	\$ (3,499,551)	\$ 99,752,184
Rancho Santiago	\$ (4,697,173)	\$ 133,889,534
Redwoods	\$ (966,111)	\$ 27,538,304
Rio Hondo	\$ (2,187,622)	\$ 62,356,603
Riverside	\$ (4,464,191)	\$ 127,248,548
San Bernardino	\$ (2,458,907)	\$ 70,089,381
San Diego	\$ (6,676,863)	\$ 190,319,164
San Francisco	\$ (5,657,684)	\$ 161,268,219
San Joaquin Delta	\$ (2,704,704)	\$ 77,095,641
San Jose-Evergreen	\$ (2,586,379)	\$ 73,722,876
San Luis Obispo	\$ (1,604,786)	\$ 45,743,272
San Mateo	\$ (3,713,660)	\$ 105,855,203
Santa Barbara	\$ (2,574,745)	\$ 73,391,243
Santa Clarita	\$ (2,556,865)	\$ 72,881,594
Santa Monica	\$ (3,694,450)	\$ 105,307,631
Sequoias	\$ (1,576,029)	\$ 44,923,558
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	\$ (1,314,783)	\$ 37,476,956
Sierra	\$ (2,608,200)	\$ 74,344,860
Siskiyou	\$ (525,236)	\$ 14,971,474
Solano	\$ (1,591,124)	\$ 45,353,840
Sonoma	\$ (3,357,266)	\$ 95,696,445
South Orange	\$ -	\$ 123,818,093
Southwestern	\$ (2,632,412)	\$ 75,035,003
State Center	\$ (4,634,249)	\$ 132,095,930
Ventura	\$ (4,498,231)	\$ 128,218,823
Victor Valley	\$ (1,654,061)	\$ 47,147,825
West Hills	\$ (1,012,039)	\$ 28,847,430
West Kern	\$ (664,361)	\$ 18,937,130
West Valley-Mission	\$ (2,866,420)	\$ 81,705,241
Yosemite	\$ (2,939,209)	\$ 83,780,022
Yuba	\$ (1,522,432)	\$ 43,395,816
	<hr/>	
	\$ (192,000,000)	\$ 5,669,132,650
	<hr/>	

Career development & college preparation funding per FTES equals \$3,232.06

2009-10 WORKLOAD REDUCTION DISPLAY DEFICIT THREATS

Restoration: System has accounted for \$26 million of a possible \$37 million in outstanding restoration. If restoration occurs beyond the \$26 million figure, we will be forced into a deficit.

Revenues: Actual Property Tax and Fee Revenue collections fall below budget estimates.

Mid-Year Cuts: State revenues continue to decline forcing further cuts to CCC general revenues that support the general apportionment.

Basic Allocation Growth: If a new center is approved in 2009-10 or a college grows larger in size, then there are no growth funds available to accommodate such an expansion in the allocation. If this occurs, we will be forced into a deficit.

ding
eficit.

es.

fund

arger in
⇒ basic

**California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop
Estimated Total Base Revenue
(as of 2009-10 Advance)**

District	Basic Allocation Revenue	Credit Base Revenue	Noncredit Base Revenue	CDCP Base Revenue	Total Base Revenue
Allan Hancock	\$5,535,909	\$37,827,473	\$2,653,002	\$1,446,156	47,462,540
Antelope Valley	4,567,125	50,488,472	129,589	0	55,185,186
Barstow	3,875,136	9,710,479	503,974	0	14,089,589
Butte	4,428,727	45,967,058	3,623,976	101,487	54,121,248
Cabrillo	5,535,909	50,593,874	867,434	0	56,997,217
Cerritos	4,428,727	74,945,390	775,286	0	80,149,403
Chabot-Las Positas	7,196,681	73,583,931	1,165,701	0	81,946,313
Chaffey	6,643,091	63,039,322	1,298,996	0	70,981,409
Citrus	4,428,727	46,482,929	3,611,019	76,083	54,598,758
Coast	11,071,817	154,173,362	1,585,433	0	166,830,612
Compton	3,321,545	21,580,713	252,564	0	25,154,822
Contra Costa	11,625,408	124,207,522	706,689	0	136,539,619
Copper Mt.	3,875,136	6,530,576	125,033	0	10,530,745
Desert	3,321,545	31,498,024	266,563	2,550,425	37,636,557
El Camino	9,964,636	86,305,687	93,768	0	96,364,091
Feather River	3,875,136	6,971,994	86,466	0	10,933,596
Foothill-DeAnza	8,857,454	145,254,674	1,932,972	0	156,045,100
Gavilan	3,875,136	21,099,945	1,647,743	149,709	26,772,533
Glendale	5,535,909	58,510,513	831,338	7,920,343	72,798,103
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	7,196,681	78,537,542	2,325,611	0	88,059,834
Hartnell	3,875,135	31,061,124	40,406	0	34,976,665
Imperial	3,321,545	31,171,730	294,314	88,656	34,876,245
Kern	14,116,567	86,898,065	809,680	2,747	101,827,059
Lake Tahoe	3,875,136	7,833,721	143,259	171,235	12,023,351
Lassen	3,875,136	6,824,372	49,272	0	10,748,780
Long Beach	6,643,091	89,482,577	1,623,258	1,768,264	99,517,190
Los Angeles	33,215,451	436,345,286	10,724,962	6,747,523	487,033,222
Los Rios	18,822,090	230,250,371	1,854,603	0	250,927,064
Marin	4,428,727	21,703,552	579,049	0	26,711,328
Mendocino-Lake	4,428,726	12,668,120	223,467	91,274	17,411,587
Merced	5,535,909	37,937,668	2,119,931	2,489,080	48,082,588
Mira Costa	5,535,909	36,974,912	3,270,727	0	45,781,548
Monterey Peninsula	3,598,340	27,897,244	5,162,470	0	36,658,054
Mt. San Antonio	5,535,909	106,585,882	3,878,543	15,128,662	131,128,996
Mt. San Jacinto	5,535,909	45,065,460	612,537	377,570	51,591,476
Napa Valley	4,151,931	23,131,475	2,338,073	0	29,621,479
North Orange County	8,857,454	123,125,065	11,497,750	9,896,139	153,376,408
Ohlone	4,428,727	36,915,102	111,363	0	41,455,192
Palo Verde	4,013,534	7,821,737	263,461	0	12,098,732
Palomar	6,643,091	83,138,886	1,182,528	2,615,227	93,579,732
Pasadena Area	6,643,091	93,734,575	1,356,311	2,566,488	104,300,465
Peralta	13,286,180	85,714,634	751,405	0	99,752,219
Rancho Santiago	8,857,454	92,900,810	6,399,155	25,732,106	133,889,525
Redwoods	4,705,522	22,827,549	5,215	0	27,538,286
Rio Hondo	4,428,727	56,359,978	1,485,187	82,676	62,356,568
Riverside	7,750,273	118,965,733	532,549	0	127,248,555
San Bernardino	7,196,681	62,875,034	17,650	0	70,089,365

**California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop
Estimated Total Base Revenue
(as of 2009-10 Advance)**

District	Basic Allocation Revenue	Credit Base Revenue	Noncredit Base Revenue	CDCP Base Revenue	Total Base Revenue
San Diego	16,607,727	143,218,923	8,566,025	21,926,444	190,319,119
San Francisco	12,179,000	113,584,922	10,471,740	25,032,557	161,268,219
San Joaquin Delta	4,982,318	70,503,815	1,609,506	0	77,095,639
San Jose-Evergreen	6,643,090	66,973,858	105,928	0	73,722,876
San Luis Obispo	4,428,727	40,330,047	694,831	289,690	45,743,295
San Mateo	9,964,635	95,763,457	127,119	0	105,855,211
Santa Barbara	6,643,091	59,482,136	4,293,773	2,972,274	73,391,274
Santa Clarita	5,535,909	65,803,004	1,098,669	443,989	72,881,571
Santa Monica	6,643,091	96,693,433	1,638,301	332,806	105,307,631
Sequoias	5,535,909	38,918,147	374,769	94,732	44,923,557
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	3,321,545	33,088,591	1,066,800	0	37,476,936
Sierra	5,674,307	68,218,755	451,793	0	74,344,855
Siskiyou	3,875,136	10,715,379	380,945	0	14,971,460
Solano	4,428,727	40,925,118	0	0	45,353,845
Sonoma	8,027,068	78,518,187	7,360,138	1,791,050	95,696,443
South Orange	7,196,681	110,215,425	5,903,142	502,845	123,818,093
Southwestern	5,535,909	67,709,320	1,730,010	59,761	75,035,000
State Center	11,071,818	119,144,354	1,879,775	0	132,095,947
Ventura	11,071,817	115,865,212	1,281,785	0	128,218,814
Victor Valley	4,428,727	41,819,687	899,440	0	47,147,854
West Hills	6,919,885	20,677,516	1,249,999	0	28,847,400
West Kern	3,875,136	15,005,283	56,711	0	18,937,130
West Valley-Mission	6,643,090	72,098,537	2,963,621	0	81,705,248
Yosemite	7,196,681	73,805,188	2,267,692	510,473	83,780,034
Yuba	7,750,272	35,301,299	344,245	0	43,395,816
Totals	\$ 498,646,976	\$ 4,897,899,735	\$ 138,627,039	\$ 133,958,471	\$ 5,669,132,221

Deferrals Community College

2009-10

The July 2009 district payment included a newly established intra-fiscal year deferral of \$200 million with the funds scheduled for repayment to districts as part of the October 2009 apportionment allocation.

The 2009-10 Budget agreement also contains inter-fiscal year deferrals for community colleges totaling \$703 million that will begin deferring monthly payments to districts on the following schedule with the repayment of the deferred amounts occurring in July, 2010:

January	\$115 million
February	\$115 million
March	\$55 million
April	\$136.5 million
May	\$81.5 million
<u>June</u>	<u>\$200 million</u>
Total Deferral =	\$703 million

California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop

**2009-10 Restoration Entitlements
(Adjusted for Workload Reduction)**

District	2008-09 P2	2008-09 P2	Total Entitlement Before Workload Adjustment	2009-10 Restoration Eligibility (Adjusted for Rebenching)			
	Restoration Eligibility	Restoration Total		Year 3 2006-07	Year 2 2007-08	Year 1 2008-09	3 Year Total
Allan Hancock	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Antelope Valley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barstow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Butte	5,264,116	5,038,661	225,455	-	217,814	-	217,814
Cabrillo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cerritos	185,171	185,171	-	-	-	-	-
Chabot-Las Positas	-	-	1,568,565	-	-	1,515,401	1,515,401
Chaffey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citrus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Compton	31,550,343	2,337,930	22,024,046	13,465,281	7,812,296	-	21,277,577
Contra Costa	212,506	-	10,303,017	-	-	9,953,813	9,953,813
Copper Mt.	512,306	512,306	-	-	-	-	-
Desert	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Camino	5,368	5,368	-	-	-	-	-
Feather River	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foothill-DeAnza	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gavilan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Glendale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hartnell	1,742,097	1,742,097	-	-	-	-	-
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Tahoe	371,400	371,400	-	-	-	-	-
Lassen	2,496,409	1,188,445	1,307,964	551,055	712,578	-	1,263,633
Long Beach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Rios	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marin	936,221	151,624	-	-	-	-	-
Mendocino-Lake	1,359,942	1,289,359	70,583	-	68,191	-	68,191
Merced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mira Costa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monterey Peninsula	1,517,280	1,102,843	-	-	-	-	-
Mt. San Antonio	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mt. San Jacinto	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa Valley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North Orange County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ohlone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palo Verde	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palomar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pasadena Area	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peralta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rancho Santiago	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Redwoods	2,255,392	2,091,816	163,576	158,032	-	-	158,032
Rio Hondo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Diego	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin Delta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Jose-Evergreen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	14,938,964	14,938,964	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Barbara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Clarita	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Monica	14,708,968	14,708,968	-	-	-	-	-
Sequoias	3,162,400	3,162,400	-	-	-	-	-
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	965,011	965,011	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	547,351	547,351	-	-	-	-	-
Solano	327,100	327,100	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Orange	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop

**2009-10 Restoration Entitlements
(Adjusted for Workload Reduction)**

District	2008-09 P2 Restoration Eligibility	2008-09 P2 Restoration Total	Total Entitlement Before Workload Adjustment	2009-10 Restoration Eligibility (Adjusted for Rebenching)			
				Year 3 2006-07	Year 2 2007-08	Year 1 2008-09	3 Year Total
Southwestern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ventura	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Victor Valley	215,470	215,470	-	-	-	-	-
West Hills	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Kern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Valley-Mission	8,667,237	7,018,475	1,648,762	1,409,299	183,581	-	1,592,880
Yosemite	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Statewide Total	91,941,052	57,900,759	37,311,968	15,583,667	8,994,460	11,469,214	36,047,341

**California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop**

Estimated Enrollment Fee and Property Tax Revenues

District	Estimated		Estimated	
	2008-09 Ptax	2009-10 Ptax	2008-09 Fees	2009-10 Fees ¹
Allan Hancock	\$11,964,952	\$11,522,688	\$2,156,811	\$2,647,006
Antelope Valley	\$6,216,058	\$5,986,292	\$2,124,341	\$2,607,156
Barstow	\$1,994,223	\$1,920,510	\$473,533	\$581,157
Butte	\$11,224,052	\$10,809,174	\$2,239,044	\$2,747,929
Cabrillo	\$20,542,002	\$19,782,702	\$3,456,873	\$4,242,543
Cerritos	\$6,940,714	\$6,684,162	\$4,213,709	\$5,171,391
Chabot-Las Positas	\$24,488,819	\$23,583,632	\$5,269,677	\$6,467,357
Chaffey	\$15,902,763	\$15,314,944	\$4,615,800	\$5,664,869
Citrus	\$3,551,674	\$3,420,392	\$3,443,426	\$4,226,040
Coast	\$88,135,850	\$84,878,059	\$11,172,000	\$13,711,147
Compton*	\$3,904,269	\$3,759,954	\$669,276	\$821,388
Contra Costa	\$74,180,058	\$71,438,119	\$9,104,912	\$11,174,256
Copper Mt.	\$1,230,997	\$1,185,495	\$402,717	\$494,246
Desert	\$22,798,823	\$21,956,103	\$2,052,922	\$2,519,506
El Camino	\$23,934,084	\$23,049,401	\$6,048,172	\$7,422,787
Feather River	\$6,073,174	\$5,848,689	\$643,122	\$789,289
Foothill-DeAnza	\$71,346,171	\$68,708,981	\$10,780,000	\$13,230,054
Gavilan	\$14,856,229	\$14,307,094	\$1,081,521	\$1,327,327
Glendale	\$7,872,912	\$7,581,903	\$3,253,600	\$3,993,071
Grossmont-Cuyamaca	\$31,518,557	\$30,353,527	\$5,417,680	\$6,648,998
Hartnell	\$19,407,096	\$18,689,746	\$1,786,148	\$2,192,100
Imperial	\$5,610,060	\$5,402,694	\$1,258,961	\$1,545,095
Kern	\$44,219,473	\$42,584,976	\$4,525,568	\$5,554,129
Lake Tahoe	\$3,611,985	\$3,478,474	\$583,204	\$715,753
Lassen	\$1,589,962	\$1,531,192	\$309,220	\$379,499
Long Beach	\$9,895,086	\$9,529,331	\$3,560,094	\$4,369,224
Los Angeles	\$150,165,851	\$144,615,226	\$19,061,000	\$23,393,142
Los Rios	\$58,334,479	\$56,178,244	\$12,256,047	\$15,041,574
Marin	\$39,441,349	\$37,983,467	\$1,317,979	\$1,617,526
Mendocino-Lake	\$5,716,878	\$5,505,563	\$543,047	\$666,470
Merced	\$10,931,504	\$10,527,440	\$1,652,729	\$2,028,358
Mira Costa	\$76,506,111	\$73,678,193	\$3,118,530	\$3,827,303
Monterey Peninsula	\$13,097,810	\$12,613,672	\$1,570,851	\$1,927,871
Mt. San Antonio	\$15,642,338	\$15,064,146	\$6,878,584	\$8,441,933
Mt. San Jacinto	\$22,351,087	\$21,524,917	\$2,940,000	\$3,608,197
Napa Valley	\$20,906,287	\$20,133,522	\$1,558,200	\$1,912,344
North Orange County	\$57,086,708	\$54,976,595	\$9,000,702	\$11,046,362
Ohlone	\$13,647,530	\$13,143,072	\$2,791,452	\$3,425,887
Palo Verde	\$1,070,839	\$1,031,257	\$143,344	\$175,923
Palomar	\$54,802,659	\$52,776,972	\$6,318,117	\$7,754,085
Pasadena Area	\$18,842,163	\$18,145,695	\$6,350,356	\$7,793,651
Peralta	\$27,165,337	\$26,161,217	\$4,636,531	\$5,690,311

**California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop**

Estimated Enrollment Fee and Property Tax Revenues

District	Estimated		Estimated	
	2008-09 Ptax	2009-10 Ptax	2008-09 Fees	2009-10 Fees ¹
Rancho Santiago	\$42,924,510	\$41,337,879	\$5,477,877	\$6,722,877
Redwoods	\$8,806,417	\$8,480,903	\$874,860	\$1,073,696
Rio Hondo	\$4,642,430	\$4,470,830	\$2,989,000	\$3,668,333
Riverside	\$29,543,367	\$28,451,347	\$7,204,120	\$8,841,456
San Bernardino	\$14,279,662	\$13,751,839	\$3,381,000	\$4,149,426
San Diego	\$73,818,392	\$71,089,821	\$7,512,873	\$9,220,382
San Francisco	\$42,637,558	\$41,061,533	\$7,295,100	\$8,953,114
San Joaquin Delta	\$26,651,751	\$25,666,614	\$3,890,381	\$4,774,578
San Jose-Evergreen	\$69,033,415	\$66,481,712	\$3,568,554	\$4,379,607
San Luis Obispo	\$29,925,564	\$28,819,417	\$3,015,543	\$3,700,909
San Mateo	\$54,895,557	\$52,866,436	\$5,469,625	\$6,712,749
Santa Barbara	\$21,371,985	\$20,582,006	\$4,397,848	\$5,397,381
Santa Clarita	\$14,088,196	\$13,567,450	\$4,998,000	\$6,133,934
Santa Monica	\$10,793,590	\$10,394,623	\$8,133,020	\$9,981,475
Sequoias	\$9,952,061	\$9,584,200	\$1,968,722	\$2,416,169
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	\$12,980,679	\$12,500,870	\$1,896,300	\$2,327,287
Sierra	\$62,777,479	\$60,457,016	\$4,834,940	\$5,933,814
Siskiyou	\$3,592,762	\$3,404,373	\$451,780	\$554,460
Solano	\$10,865,283	\$10,463,666	\$2,691,671	\$3,303,428
Sonoma	\$41,185,883	\$39,663,517	\$6,020,872	\$7,389,282
South Orange	\$154,636,537	\$148,920,661	\$9,571,992	\$11,747,493
Southwestern	\$20,804,582	\$20,035,576	\$4,236,619	\$5,199,508
State Center	\$29,013,517	\$27,941,082	\$5,462,817	\$6,704,394
Ventura	\$49,836,320	\$47,994,205	\$9,038,459	\$11,092,700
Victor Valley	\$8,938,898	\$8,608,487	\$2,131,695	\$2,616,182
West Hills	\$2,515,789	\$2,422,797	\$955,500	\$1,172,664
West Kern	\$9,213,036	\$8,872,492	\$607,753	\$745,882
West Valley-Mission	\$67,558,064	\$65,060,895	\$4,945,070	\$6,068,975
Yosemite	\$33,695,656	\$32,450,153	\$3,920,000	\$4,810,929
Yuba	\$21,947,844	\$21,136,579	\$1,458,237	\$1,789,662
Total (72 districts)	\$2,101,645,757	\$2,023,906,411	\$299,180,028	\$367,177,000

¹Note: The total estimated enrollment fee revenue of \$367,177,000 includes an estimated \$80 positive adjustment due to increased fee rates per FTES.

Unconstrained District Growth Rates

DISTRICTS	ADULT POP CHANGE	HIGH SCHOOL GRAD CHANGE	BLENDED RATE	UNDERSERVED RATE	FACILITY RATE	FINAL GROWTH RATE
Allan Hancock	0.17%	1.26%	0.72%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Antelope Valley	0.73%	3.52%	2.29%	0.00%	0.00%	2.29%
Barstow	-0.03%	1.38%	0.49%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Butte	0.33%	1.41%	0.90%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Cabrillo	0.23%	4.42%	2.33%	0.00%	2.27%	4.60%
Cerritos	0.04%	6.06%	3.28%	0.04%	0.00%	3.32%
Chabot-Las Positas	0.38%	3.93%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	2.38%
Chaffey	0.35%	5.39%	3.14%	1.14%	0.62%	4.28%
Citrus	0.02%	6.10%	3.71%	0.00%	0.00%	3.71%
Coast	-0.09%	2.54%	1.32%	0.00%	0.00%	1.32%
Compton	-0.02%	-2.78%	-0.02%	1.27%	0.00%	1.26%
Contra Costa	0.20%	3.62%	2.23%	0.07%	0.10%	2.33%
Copper Mountain	0.70%	2.48%	1.27%	0.22%	0.00%	1.49%
Desert	0.86%	6.78%	3.87%	1.00%	0.00%	4.88%
El Camino	0.14%	7.11%	4.22%	0.10%	0.00%	4.32%
Feather River	0.10%	-2.09%	0.10%	0.00%	2.78%	2.87%
Foothill-DeAnza	0.12%	4.81%	2.36%	0.00%	0.00%	2.36%
Gavilan	0.37%	6.01%	2.77%	0.00%	0.00%	2.77%
Glendale	0.13%	4.71%	2.24%	0.00%	0.00%	2.24%
Grossmont	0.18%	7.40%	4.19%	0.00%	0.00%	4.19%
Hartnell	0.15%	3.63%	1.75%	0.04%	1.64%	3.39%
Imperial	0.85%	15.70%	8.84%	0.00%	0.00%	8.84%
Kern	0.31%	1.70%	1.08%	0.13%	0.00%	1.21%
Lake Tahoe	0.33%	-6.04%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Lassen	0.06%	0.36%	0.19%	0.65%	0.00%	1.00%
Long Beach	0.22%	-0.51%	0.22%	0.06%	0.00%	1.00%
Los Angeles	0.57%	-1.86%	0.57%	0.77%	5.94%	6.51%
Los Rios	0.13%	2.48%	1.24%	0.00%	0.01%	1.25%
Marin	0.18%	5.56%	2.16%	0.70%	0.00%	2.87%
Mendocino	0.18%	0.29%	0.24%	0.42%	0.00%	1.00%
Merced	0.47%	-0.28%	0.47%	0.31%	3.75%	4.22%
Mira Costa	0.29%	3.29%	1.91%	0.63%	0.00%	2.54%
Monterey	0.03%	2.02%	0.77%	0.00%	8.05%	8.82%
Mt San Antonio	-0.04%	1.13%	0.60%	0.00%	11.05%	11.65%
Mt San Jacinto	0.70%	12.73%	7.46%	0.88%	0.00%	8.34%
Napa	0.32%	-0.14%	0.32%	0.00%	0.77%	1.09%
North Orange	0.15%	3.92%	2.16%	0.07%	1.65%	3.81%
Ohlone	0.21%	1.91%	1.25%	0.00%	0.00%	1.26%
Palomar	0.37%	4.42%	2.53%	0.00%	0.00%	2.53%
Palo Verde	-0.91%	10.67%	1.51%	0.00%	0.00%	1.51%
Pasadena	0.22%	8.46%	4.95%	0.00%	0.00%	4.95%
Peralta	0.33%	8.19%	2.86%	0.01%	0.00%	2.87%
Rancho Santiago	0.17%	0.31%	0.23%	0.00%	1.93%	2.16%

Unconstrained District Growth Rates

DISTRICTS	ADULT POP CHANGE	HIGH SCHOOL GRAD CHANGE	BLENDED RATE	UNDERSERVED RATE	FACILITY RATE	FINAL GROWTH RATE
Redwoods	0.26%	-4.96%	0.26%	0.14%	0.00%	1.00%
Rio Hondo	-0.02%	3.21%	1.54%	0.13%	0.00%	1.67%
Riverside	0.26%	6.56%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%
San Bernardino	0.07%	1.76%	0.85%	0.23%	0.00%	1.09%
San Diego	0.42%	-0.07%	0.42%	0.43%	4.16%	4.57%
San Francisco	0.51%	0.26%	0.51%	0.19%	0.00%	1.00%
San Joaquin Delta	0.27%	2.79%	1.71%	0.21%	0.00%	1.92%
San Jose	0.45%	-0.46%	0.45%	1.39%	1.07%	1.84%
San Luis Obispo	0.29%	4.76%	2.99%	0.00%	0.00%	2.99%
San Mateo	0.19%	1.81%	1.02%	0.20%	0.00%	1.21%
Santa Barbara	0.39%	0.96%	0.70%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Santa Clarita	1.77%	6.89%	4.87%	0.00%	1.45%	6.32%
Santa Monica	0.31%	-0.93%	0.31%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Sequoias	0.46%	-0.35%	0.46%	0.36%	4.85%	5.31%
Shasta	0.24%	2.00%	1.16%	0.04%	0.95%	2.11%
Sierra	0.81%	2.40%	1.76%	0.00%	2.74%	4.49%
Siskiyou	1.15%	-3.08%	1.15%	0.00%	5.07%	6.22%
Solano	0.22%	-0.20%	0.22%	0.52%	0.00%	1.00%
Sonoma	0.20%	3.40%	1.70%	0.00%	4.37%	6.06%
South Orange	0.35%	4.25%	2.38%	0.11%	5.18%	7.56%
Southwestern	0.12%	8.17%	4.77%	0.00%	0.64%	5.41%
State Center	0.42%	-0.36%	0.42%	0.00%	0.54%	1.00%
Ventura	0.26%	8.35%	5.32%	0.00%	3.91%	9.23%
Victor Valley	0.09%	6.06%	3.15%	0.00%	0.00%	3.15%
West Hills	0.93%	-4.19%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
West Kern	7.25%	1.39%	7.25%	0.00%	0.00%	7.25%
West Valley	0.10%	-0.61%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Yosemite	1.69%	-5.11%	1.69%	0.20%	0.00%	1.89%
Yuba	0.41%	3.60%	1.98%	0.00%	0.00%	1.98%

* FINAL UNCONSTRAINED RATES ARE ADJUSTED SO ALL DISTRICTS ARE GUARANTEED AT LEAST 1% GROWTH

**California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop
State Approved and Grandfathered Centers**

The list below specifies both State Approved educational centers and Grandfathered centers
(grandfathered centers appear in bold print)

List as of 08/03/09	District/Center
Allan Hancock Joint CCD Lompoc Valley Center	Monterey Peninsula CCD Ft. Ord Center
Antelope Valley CCD Palmdale Center	Mt. San Jacinto CCD Menifee Valley Center
Cabrillo CCD Watsonville Center	Napa Valley CCD Upper Valley Center
Chaffey CCD Chino Center Fontana Learning Center	North Orange County CCD School of Continuing Education
Contra Costa CCD San Ramon Valley Center	Ohlone CCD Fremont-Newark Center
Foothill-DeAnza CCD Middlefield Center	Palo Verde CCD Needles Center
Glendale CCD Garfield Center	Palomar CCD Escondido Center
Hartnell CCD King City Center	Pasadena Area Community Education Center
Kern CCD Delano Center Eastern Sierra Center Southern Kern Southwest Center	Rancho Santiago CCD Centennial Education Center
Long Beach CCD Pacific Coast Campus	Redwoods CCD Del Norte Center Mendocino Coast Center
Los Rios CCD El Dorado Center North Natomas Center Davis Center	Riverside CCD Moreno Valley Center Norco Valley Center
Marin CCD Indian Valley Campus	San Diego CCD Center City Education Cultural Complex Mid-City North City West City
Mendocino-Lake CCD Lake County Center Willits Center	San Francisco CCD Airport CC Center Alemany CC Center Chinatown/North Beach CC Center John Adams CC Center John O'Connell Trade Tech Center Mission CC Center San Francisco Downtown CC Center Southeast CC Center
Merced CCD Merced CCD Los Baños Center	
MiraCosta CCD Community Learning Center San Elijo Center	
San Joaquin Delta CCD	

California Community Colleges
2009-10 Budget Workshop
State Approved and Grandfathered Centers

The list below specifies both State Approved educational centers and Grandfathered centers
(grandfathered centers appear in bold print)

List as of 08/03/09	District/Center
	Tracy Center
San Luis Obispo County CCD	North County Center
Santa Barbara CCD	Goleta Valley Center Schott Continuing Ed. Center
Santa Clarita CCD	Canyon Country Center
Santa Monica CCD	Academy of Entertainment Technology
Sequoias CCD	Center for Agriculture Science and Technology
Sierra CCD	Western Nevada County Center Tahoe-Truckee Center
Solano County CCD	Vacaville Center
Sonoma County JCD	Petaluma Center Public Safety Training Center Shone Farm Agricultural Center
Southwestern CCD	Otay Mesa Center
State Center CCD	Madera County Education Center Vocational Training Center Willow International Center
West Hills CCD	North District Center
Yuba CCD	Lake County Center

Note: The SB 361 grandfathered centers (now referred to as "State approved" centers) shown on this list are derived from a list of centers identified as CPEC approved "grandfathered" centers in operation prior to April 1974. That list of approved grandfathered centers was further modified by the following considerations: 1) Is the center owned or controlled thru a long-term lease by the district; 2) Has it been in continuous operation since 1974; 3) Is it a "comprehensive" center with an administrator and student services on site; 4) Does it serve at least 100 FTES.

California Community Colleges - Categorical Funding*

2009-10

	Budget Act AB4x-1	ARRA Federal Funds	State General Funds	Flexibility Allowed
Categorical Programs				
Student Financial Aid Administration	52,884,000		52,884,000	No
Foster Care Education Program	5,254,000		5,254,000	No
Fund for Student Success	5,262,820	1,470,219	3,792,601	No
CalWORKs	37,043,000	10,348,318	26,694,682	No
Student Success Initiative - Basic Skills	27,804,000	7,767,315	20,036,685	No
Nursing Support	18,564,000	5,186,032	13,377,968	No
Disabled Students	96,057,240	26,834,514	69,222,726	No
Extended Opportunity Programs & Services	89,188,000	24,915,526	64,272,474	No
Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education	12,949,400	3,617,539	9,331,861	No
Telecom & Technology Services	21,217,380	5,927,279	15,290,101	No
** Academic Senate	317,560	88,713	228,847	Yes
** Childcare Tax Bail Out	4,648,480	1,298,598	3,349,882	Yes
** Equal Employment Opportunity	1,187,960	331,868	856,092	Yes
** Economic Development	31,817,200	8,888,441	22,928,759	Yes
** Apprenticeship	9,955,880	2,781,271	7,174,609	Yes
** Part-time Faculty Office Hours	4,876,960	1,362,426	3,514,534	Yes
** Part-time Faculty Health Insurance	680,000	189,965	490,035	Yes
** Part-time Faculty Compensation	34,563,040	9,655,518	24,907,522	Yes
** Transfer Education and Articulation	968,320	270,510	697,810	Yes
** Matriculation - credit	55,231,760	15,429,524	39,802,236	Yes
** Matriculation - non-credit	13,017,000	3,636,424	9,380,576	Yes
** Physical Plant and Instructional Support				Yes
*** Career Technical Education	48,000,000		48,000,000	No
Subtotal Categorical	571,488,000	130,000,000	441,488,000	

*Unresolved issues: 1) specific allocations of ARRA and state funds to each categorical program; 2) status of statewide and regional projects; and 3) status of SB 70 CTE funding.

** Flexibility provision applied to these categorical programs and allows funds to be moved from these programs into any categorical program. Categorical programs under flexibility rules lock-in 2008-09 district allocation level, less the 2009-10 cut, through 2012-13.

*** Reflects a shift in SB 1133 (2006 Prop. 98 Settlement Funds) to Budget Act

California Community College Categorical Funding 2009-10

Assembly Bill X4 1 revises the *2009-10 Budget Act* and makes substantial cuts to most of the CCC categorical programs. AB X4 1 exempts two programs from cuts (1% increase to Financial Aid and no cut to Foster Care), fully eliminates one program (Physical Plant/Instructional Equipment), and makes a range of cuts from 15% to 32% to the other categorical programs. The accompanying Table lists all the CCC categorical programs and shows the breakout of the federal and state funds that total to the AB X4 1 amounts.

In the revised Budget Act, categorical funding allocations are drawn from both state and federal funding. The federal funds, provided from American Recovery and Reinvestment Act State Stabilization monies, are assumed to total \$130 million. However, the federal allocations are only estimates at this time, and it is unclear what the final dollar amount of federal funds will be to support the revised Budget Act amounts. Therefore, the August Advance Apportionment certification for each program is based on **state funds only**. Once we know the final federal allocation, we will recertify each program's 2009-10 allocation as part of a September/October Advance Apportionment.

In addition, AB X2 1 (the education budget trailer bill) provides categorical flexibility for districts for the categorical programs highlighted in the shaded area of the Table. Under the flexibility provision, districts are allowed to redirect funds from any of the categorical programs in the shaded area to support any other categorical program funded in the state budget. Before exercising this flexibility, districts would be required to discuss the redirection of funds at a regularly scheduled public meeting and take testimony from the public. This flexibility would apply to fiscal years 2009-10 through 2012-13. In addition, for the categorical programs falling under the flexibility provision, the proposal **locks in** funding for each district at the same amount received by the district in 2008-09, less the 2009-10 cut, and **locks in** that annual funding amount through 2012-13. The categorical flexibility language from AB X4 2, is provided below.

Please be advised that at the time this item was written, it appears that a cleanup bill will be introduced to remove ambiguity regarding the categorical funding allocations and flexibility provisions. We will discuss the ambiguous issues and the status of the cleanup bill at the Budget Workshop. Finally, further guidance governing the allocation and flexibility provisions for categorical programs for 2009-10 will be forthcoming soon from the Chancellor's Office.

CATEGORICAL FLEXIBILITY LANGUAGE

ASSEMBLY BILL X4 2

SEC. 32. Section 84043 is added to the Education Code, to read:

84043. (a) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless otherwise prohibited under federal law, for the 2009–10 to 2012–13 fiscal years, inclusive, community college districts may use

funding received, pursuant to subdivision (b), from any of the programs listed in paragraph (2) that are contained in Item 6870-101-0001 of Section 2.00 of the annual Budget Act, for the purposes of any of the programs contained in Schedule (2) and Schedules (4) to (23), inclusive, of Item 6870-101-0001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2009.

(2) (A) Apprenticeship.

(B) Matriculation.

(C) Academic Senate for the Community Colleges.

(D) Equal Employment Opportunity.

(E) Part-time Faculty Health Insurance.

(F) Part-time Faculty Compensation.

(G) Part-time Faculty Office Hours.

(H) Economic Development.

(I) Transfer Education and Articulation.

(J) Physical Plant and Instructional Support.

(K) *Career Technical Education*. NOTE, WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PURSUING CLEANUP LEGISLATION TO EXCLUDE CTE FROM FLEXIBILITY.

(L) Campus Childcare Tax Bailout.

(b) For the 2009–10 to 2012–13 fiscal years, inclusive, the chancellor shall apportion from the amounts provided in the annual Budget Act for the programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), an amount to a community college district, based on the same relative proportion that the district received in the 2008–09 fiscal year for the programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a). The amounts allocated shall be adjusted for any greater or lesser amount appropriated for the items enumerated in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a).

(c) (1) This section does not obligate the state to refund or repay reductions made pursuant to this section. A decision by a district to reduce funding pursuant to this section for a state-mandated local program shall constitute a waiver of the subvention of funds that the district is otherwise entitled to pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution on the amount so reduced.

(2) If a community college district elects to use funding received pursuant to subdivision (b) in the manner authorized pursuant to subdivision (a), the governing board of the district shall, at a regularly scheduled open public hearing, take testimony from the public, discuss, and shall approve or disapprove the proposed use of funding. (3) (A) If a community college district elects to use funding received pursuant to subdivision (b) in the manner authorized pursuant to subdivision (a), the district shall continue to report the expenditures pursuant to this section by using the appropriate codes to indicate the activities for which these funds were expended using the existing standard reporting process as determined by the chancellor. (B) The chancellor shall collect the information in subparagraph (A) and shall provide that information to the Department of Finance and to the appropriate policy and budget committees of the Legislature on or before April 15, 2010, and annually thereafter by April 15 of each year, through 2014.

(d) For the 2009–10 to 2012–13 fiscal years, inclusive, community college districts that elect to use funding in the manner authorized pursuant to subdivision (a) shall be deemed to be in compliance with the program and funding requirements contained in statutory, regulatory, and provisional language, associated with the programs enumerated in subdivision (a).