Happy Holiday Greetings to the CIOs!

Normally, there is no Consultation Council meeting in December, but at the request of the Academic Senate, a brief meeting was held yesterday morning. The agenda was sent out late on the 9th of December, and I apologize that I did not get that to you. Since this was a two item meeting, I'm sending you my notes (below) rather than a summary.

I hope you ALL will take some time to **read very carefully the proposed Title V changes to pre-requisites (agenda item 2)**. The Academic Senate has redrafted this. I need to know from you if you think that this redraft addresses the concerns that have been raised in the field. This is slated for the Board of Governors meeting in January, and as you will see in the notes below, there was no consensus on this item. The main reason is that the CCLC and the CSSOs would like more time to review the language and understand the implications of some of the revisions.

The Board of Governors meets next January 10th - 11th in Sacramento. I would very, very much appreciate your input on the Title V pre-req proposed revisions. You can read them by using the link below in the agenda to the "digest" for that item.

Finally, the other item discussed was a proposal to allow a FON calculation "exception" if a district has parcel tax revenue. I've not heard anything from the field on this, but if you have a quick skim of my notes below you will see that there was a sharp divide on that issue as well!

Have a wonderful holiday break!

Melinda Nish
Vice President, Instruction
Orange Coast College
President, CCCCIO Executive Board

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 determent 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.