

AGENDA
Consultation Council
Thursday, December 16, 2010
Chancellor's Office, Room 3A and B
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811

1. Full Time Faculty Obligation Number ([Digest](#))

The proposal recognizes that parcel tax revenue is temporary, and in years when the BOG freezes the FON, then any part-time faculty hired using the parcel tax revenue will be backed out and not counted in the FON calculation.

CFT is against this exception. This is adding an exception to an exception.

San Mateo speaks to the rationale for why they want this exception.

CEO group supports these changes.

Chancellor Scott supports this because he supports every tool that colleges may have to help them address the budget crisis. Governor Brown has indicated that every facet of the budget will be cut. So Scott is very much in favor of parcel taxes. There is no argument that 75/25 is ideal for FT/PT. But the issue is that district's are struggling with budgets. So we should not use temporary money for long-time commitments. Usage of parcel taxes will not occur very often because you cannot pass this tax easily.

CCCI speaks against it. No way to be able to use just parcel tax and financial planning should be as such to hire more FT faculty.

Currently there are \$100 million in the districts' ending balances. At San Mateo 11.7% additional funds went into reserves. Why are we changing law when there is money sitting there?

San Mateo rep explains they are taking the ending balances to smooth out adjustments to budget cuts.

In sum, there is a sharp disagreement and that will be reported to the BOG.

CCCI wants to discuss quality. FON can be percentage or the number. The percentage, the number of PT drops, and your percentage goes up so you don't have to hire FT, which could allow the FT number to go down. But the pressure to meet accreditation standards is huge and we need FT because PT just can't do it. But with fewer and fewer FT you can't get the work done and you are setting yourself up for trouble. This is just one more exception that is going to muddy the waters and make things worse. And parcel tax is small, so financial planning should be able to work with this and not change the law. The gain in terms of flexibility is not worth it in terms of the deterrent this will cause.

Academic Senate speaks to the correlation between student success and FT faculty so this is an example of how NOT to strengthen student success.

2. Discussion on prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories ([Digest](#))

CCLC is not prepared to support this yet because the CEO group needs more time to review. CSSO group agrees and has questions.

Question about tracking, what and why? What is the level of scrutiny and why? Stephanie Low says they will add a data element. They want to make sure that there is not an onslaught of new pre-reqs. If there is a determination there is a problem then the Chancellor's office will participate in the solution. Language may be awkward. There will be more discussion about the language. No consensus decision of the council to present to the BOG.

3. Other

No other agenda items are presented.