



**COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA**

Agenda Item Details

Meeting Apr 18, 2014 - CEOCCC Board Regular Meeting
 Category 4. Legislation and Finance
 Subject 4.5 Faculty Obligation Number
 Type Action, Discussion

Background

In the community college reform legislation AB 1725, a state goal was established that 75% of credit hours would be taught by full-time faculty. Districts were promised funds for "program improvement" and, when such funds were provided, progress toward the state goal was expected. A district's progress toward the goal was measured by a "faculty obligation number" ("FON") that sought a floor that rose with enrollment growth, beyond which could be specifically funded improvement toward the goal. A district's FON was based on the district's quantity of full-time faculty in 1988.

Unfortunately, funds for program improvement were only provided in two state budgets before the 1990s recession led to the abandoning of the program. Thus, FONs have grown with enrollment growth but there has been little system progress toward 75%. Additionally, the "base year" concept without programmatic improvement has led to a highly unequal playing field among districts. This unequal playing field creates compensation disparity among districts, with some paying higher classroom salaries because they are required to employ fewer full-time faculty.

The mandated full-time faculty obligation ranges from 8 per 1,000 credit FTES to 24 per 1,000 credit FTES, with the average of around 15 per 1,000 credit FTES. At one time, this seemed sensible because districts had widely varying credit apportionment rates, although that was solved with SB 361 in 2006. For that reason, it no longer seems sensible to have such widely ranging FONs.

Proposed Equalization

Staff recommends that an equalization program be incorporated into the regulation that requires districts to add full-time faculty when they receive growth funds or funds specifically to increase full-time faculty. Specifically, "high FON" districts would be provided modest relief and "low FON" districts would be asked to add a small amount of additional full-time faculty. The calculation would be a multiplier "weighting factor" that would be applied to the existing FON calculation.

Here is an example if all districts had funded credit FTES growth of 2% in 2014-15:

Quartile ranking of district FON per funded credit FTES	Growth	Weighting Factor
Top quartile (18 districts) 17.2-24.8 FT faculty/1,000 credit FTES	2%	0.8
Second quartile (18 districts) 14.9-16.9 FT faculty/1,000 credit FTES	2%	0.9
Third quartile (18 districts) 13.4-14.9 FT faculty/1,000 credit FTES	2%	1.1
Fourth quartile (18 districts)		

3.7-13.3 FT faculty/1,000 credit FTES	2%	1.2
---------------------------------------	----	-----

For example, let's say that a district is in the third quartile and has 10,000 FTES and a FON of 155--a FT faculty/1,000 credit FTES of 15.5. Under the existing rules, if this district receives 2% credit FTES growth, it would be require to increase its full-time faculty by 3.1 for Fall 2015. Using the weighted formula, it would have a slightly higher FON increase of 3.41 (155 base FON x 2% x 1.1).

If the district was in the second quartile, it would have a slightly lower FON increase of 2.79 (155 base FON x 2% x 0.9).

This change would not equalize the system overnight or even quickly, and there is nothing magical about the proposed weighting factors. However, rather than increasing the disparity among districts, they would begin to move closer together.

Budget Priorities

In addition to changing the FON calculation, staff recommends that the League support \$25 million in funds to increase full-time hires in the 2014-15 budget and in successive budgets as state revenues allow. These funds will:

- provide a faster equalization among districts
- bring cohorts of new faculty into the system who can work on curricular innovation to improve student success
- enable districts to better diversify faculty ranks

Issue for Discussion

- Is this proposal worthy of introducing to the Consultation Council?

[fon-weightingproposal.xls \(115 KB\)](#)