



ASSOCIATION OF CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICIALS

October 11, 2019

Eloy O. Oakley, Chancellor
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chancellor Oakley:

I am writing on behalf of the Association of Chief Business Officials (ACBO) Board. As you know, the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) was established in 1988 and created a "base" FON by reporting the number of full-time faculty that each district had in Fall 1988 without taking into consideration the breadth and depth of programs offered or any attempt to equalize the "base" amongst districts. Since that time each district's FON has changed with the change in credit FTES.

The ACBO Board was asked to provide some recommendations on how the FON could be revised in order to better address the current learning and funding environment while making progress towards the 75/25 split between full-time and part-time faculty. We offer the following suggestions for consideration of the FON calculation:

- Full-time faculty overload FTE should be included in the calculation. This could be accomplished in one of two ways.
 - First, we could reduce the part-time faculty FTE by the FTE calculated for classes taught by full-time faculty overload.
 - Second, we could include the overload in the calculation of full-time faculty whereby a full-time faculty could generate 1.2 or 1.5 FTE depending upon the amount of overload taught rather than just 1 FTE.
- Eliminate the financial penalty for not meeting the FON as is not necessary under the new Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). If fewer full-time faculty reduces student success, then the SCFF will award less funding for the district.
 - At a minimum, if the penalty has to remain, it should reflect the SCFF and be discounted by 30% to reflect that we only receive 70% of our funding from FTES.

It's unclear to us what the ultimate goal is related to the FON and the 75/25 split. These are two entirely different measures and while it may seem that they are one in the same, they can actually differ greatly. It is very common for districts to make progress towards one without making progress towards the other. For instance, since Fall 2008, the system has increased the actual number of full-

time faculty by 284 (1.5%) while the compliance FON went down by 199 (1.15%). Conversely, during that same time period, the 75/25 split went down by 3.84 percentage points (6.35%). For Fall 2018, the system reported 19,269 full-time faculty at a time when the FON was 17,185. The system is over the obligation by 2,084 (12.13%) full-time faculty yet the 75/25 split is only at 56.55%. Clearly, we have made progress on the FON but not on the split.

It's become apparent to us that the 75/25 goal is untenable. It is counterintuitive to what we are being asked to do on a system wide basis for the *Vision for Success*. In order to meet the *Vision for Success* goals, many of our CTE courses are lower enrolled, many courses required to achieve an associate degree or associate degree for transfer are lower enrolled, and many new programs are taught by part-time faculty until the programs flourish and can sustain a full-time faculty load. Each of these scenarios helps a district make progress toward the *Vision for Success* goals, yet also bring down the percentage of full-time to part-time faculty.

While we agree with the notion that full-time faculty can help our students succeed, we do not agree with mandating progress towards the 75/25 goal without the changes reflected above and without full funding from the State to do so. Furthermore, it is imperative that any proposed changes be thoughtfully designed after analyzing the impacts the changes will have on districts. We must avoid unintended consequences and not place an undue burden on districts to comply with any new requirements without the necessary lead-time to plan and budget for the change.

Respectfully,



Ann-Marie Gabel
ACBO President

cc: ACBO Board
Christian Osmena – Vice Chancellor, CCCCCO