This is an interesting one. It predates my arrival in CA. However, I sure heard about it when I arrived. My guess is that there never was a "standard" in the strictest sense of that word as regards faculty load; otherwise, we'd be called to account for our compliance by the State, as we are with the 50% law and the faculty obligation. Thus, it's likely an informal standard re: faculty load. And in that context, it was and thus remains an operational standard, even if informal, as it still regarded across the State as sacrosanct. It should also be noted that some districts have actually incorporated "525" in their collective bargaining agreements, hence more support that this is a standard, albeit perhaps an informal one agreed to by all.

525 is embedded in the Ed Code and Title 5, as well as in the Student Attendance Accounting Manual, as a requirement in the calculation of FTES. It is important to note that the method of counting FTES varies by state and by segment within states. I know first-hand, as I studied that during my Colorado days. I was also one of the three architects of the rules on how an institution would determine FTES in that State, which spun off my earlier work on the rules for Colorado's community colleges. (Some good war stories on those bygone days I'll have to share about two colleges in particular, Morgan CC and Colorado Mountain.) So, California is what it is in this regard, and 525 WSCH is the barometer with meaning.

I believe that a lot of this reflects the university back in the day, like when I was young and before...and even before you. The basic model of a full-time student was 15 hours a week in class...essentially five 3-hour (aka unit) courses. This spun out of the famous, or infamous, Carnegie Unit. For the CCC, I believe this model undergirds the whole FTES reporting methodology. We have a full-time student in five, 3-unit courses having three class sessions per course each week for a 17.5 week semester. That's 15 hours of class-time per week. For one semester, that yields 262.5 WSCH (15 x 17.5). For an academic year, one then multiplies this result by two (semesters), and you get 525 WSCH...one-full time student. We have to keep in mind that all this is mythology. It is an "equivalent" student, the "E" in FTES. And why do we have equivalency? Well, one reason is funding. The states want some basis by which they can distribute funding to colleges and universities, and virtually all use enrollments for

that purpose. Though they take different ways to get there, they typically end up with FTES. All colleges have students who generate enrollments, and if, in a given segment or State, all are counting by the same rules, then Voila, we have a fair funding system...or so goes the myth. (Other aspects of the mythology, such as how does an hour have 50 minutes, etc. are beyond the scope of this writing.)

Now let’s start shifting towards faculty load. If we had one of the old President's faculty load reports, perhaps it would shed some light on this subject. I recall seeing one or two a quarter century or so ago, but I really have little memory of them. California had me so confused when I got here, it took me a while to figure out which way was up. But let's go with what I've got.

Program-based funding came into the mix with AB 1725. Though I discarded my files on that subject when I retired, I was able to find one little gem in Title 5. If you go to Division 6 (Community Colleges), Chapter 9 (Fiscal Support), Subchapter 8 (General Apportionment Funding), Article 2 (Credit Instruction), Section 58712 (Credit Instruction Standards), one can observe funding elements for the pre-SB 361 funding formula (aka Program Based Funding). One of them, subsection (a), states "The credit instruction standards per college shall be as follows. Item (3), cites a standard of "a student/faculty ration of 25 to 1." Two comments about this. Program Based Funding was an attempt to secure improved funding for the CCC by establishing standards for funding in various areas. Nice idea, and research-based, but it was dead-end proposition for reasons I won't go into for the sake of brevity. It was never funded at 100% of standard nor anywhere closed to that. So much for "25 to 1." The colleges weren't there then, or even close, and without program improvement funding over the years, they've not had the wherewithal to move closer. Second, the whole idea of "25 to 1" was officially shelved by Section 58707, a nullification coming out of the move to the SB 361 funding model.

So, we've now established that California community colleges have to operate at some level above "25 to 1." I think we again go back to the days of yore. Once upon a time, and I'm not making this up, faculty were expected to teach 15 hours a week (probably more than that, if truly once upon a time, like when

they also cleaned blackboards, advised students, etc.). I'm admittedly guessing here. First, I'm guessing that for California the number was well above 25, as the system grew out of K-12 as "junior colleges" (aka the first two years of college). They weren't community colleges, let alone comprehensive community colleges. Hence, they were expected to have larger class sizes, as that's the way it was for the first two years of college in those days.

But what is that larger class size? Let's go back to the 3-unit class used in the example on page 1 of your paper. With 35 students in that class, one get 105 WSCH as you observed. As you also noted, that would be .2 FTEF in terms of faculty load. So, 5 of these classes, the load of yesteryear, would be 525, aka a full-time teaching load. So, to make it all work...FTES, funding and faculty load...is not 525 at the center of the CCC universe? It's the point where everything is balanced. Increase average load...that's called improving productivity, at least as regards the quantitative side...and that should yield an improved financial picture. Decrease it...then productivity declines, and that's not a good thing in any economic system, as Peter starts robbing Paul. So my bet is that somewhere along the way, somebody came up with the number 35. After all, the effects of improved or decreased productivity are sound principles economically. What is at play is the balancing point. What's your bet?