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Presentation Outline

• Welcome (Ian Walton)

• How did we get here? (Rich Hansen)

• “Why Faculty Matter” paper: Core principles & analysis (Greg Gilbert)

• Application of “Why Faculty Matter” paper to accreditation standards (Ian Walton)

• Discussion (Ian / All)
Concise History of CCC Student Success

**Funding Per ADA/FTES**
- Appendage of K-12 School Districts

**1960: Master Plan**
- Educating top 100% of the State’s Students

**1988: AB 1725**
- CCC Closer to Higher Ed with Program-Based Funding

**Circa 2000: Criticism**
- Transfer, Employment, Achievement Gaps
Concise History of CCC Student Success (cont.)

2007: Basic Skills Initiative

2010: Student Success Task Force Report

2012: Student Success & Support Program (SSSP)
2018: Student Equity & Achievement Program (SEAP)

2018: Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF)
- Outcomes-based funding
Full-Time Faculty Percentage over Time

Sources: Workgroup on 75/25 Issues Report (June 2005), Regulations Workgroup data (Dec 2017), and Chancellor’s Office Full-Time Faculty Obligation webpage

• The Workgroup on 75/25 noted the “static nature of the system’s average percentage over time,” 1988 to 2004.

  Fall 1988: 63.1%  Fall 2004: 62.2%
  But it also noted “the trend was in the WRONG direction,” and it got WORSE!
  Fall 2005: 61.3%  Fall 2009: 58.5%  Fall 2013: 57.1%
  Fall 2006: 59.2%  Fall 2010: 56.9%  Fall 2014: 55.1%
  Fall 2007: 59.2%  Fall 2011: 56.9%  Fall 2015: 55.0%
  Fall 2008: 57.7%  Fall 2012: 57.6%  Fall 2016: 56.4%

• The Workgroup on 75/25 noted “the static nature of the system average masks tremendous variation between districts.”
  In Fall 1988, percentages ranged from a low of 33.9% to a high of 78.1%.  
  In Fall 2004, percentages ranged from a low of 46.1% to a high of 78.6%.  
  In Fall 2017, percentages ranged from a low of 36.3% to a high of 72.4%.  

• The Workgroup on 75/25 noted “the static nature of the system average masks tremendous variation between districts.”
  In Fall 1988, percentages ranged from a low of 33.9% to a high of 78.1%.  
  In Fall 2004, percentages ranged from a low of 46.1% to a high of 78.6%.  
  In Fall 2017, percentages ranged from a low of 36.3% to a high of 72.4%.  

  Fall 1988: 63.1%  Fall 2004: 62.2%
  But it also noted “the trend was in the WRONG direction,” and it got WORSE!
  Fall 2005: 61.3%  Fall 2009: 58.5%  Fall 2013: 57.1%
  Fall 2006: 59.2%  Fall 2010: 56.9%  Fall 2014: 55.1%
  Fall 2007: 59.2%  Fall 2011: 56.9%  Fall 2015: 55.0%
  Fall 2008: 57.7%  Fall 2012: 57.6%  Fall 2016: 56.4%
Faculty Numbers

FT Faculty Percentage
(# FT Faculty/Total # Faculty)
2002-2016

Full-Time and Part-Time Headcount
2006-16

- Full-time faculty
- Part-time faculty
An Impossible Dream?

Certainly, the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) presents significant challenges, but the increased funding flexibility with the transition from the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) to the Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP) provides an opportunity to move forward on and expand upon prior efforts to address the faculty role in student success.

- Increase Full-Time Tenured Faculty Positions
  - AB 1725 and “program-based funding” in 1988
  - SB 361 and “equalization under FTES funding” in 2006
  - Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP) in 2018
  - Regulations Workgroup on the 50 Percent Law and 75 Percent Goal

- Increase Support for Part-Time Faculty (late 1990s/early 2000s programs)
  - Office Hours
  - Medical Benefits
  - Compensation Parity
  - Participation in Governance
Core Principles & Analysis of “Why Faculty Matter”

• The Scope of the Research
  • Hundreds of papers, books, and surveys produced one central finding:
    
    **Full-time faculty presence is essential for improved student success outcomes**

  • Ongoing faculty/student Interaction is the single greatest contributor to student success
  • Full-time faculty are the institutional glue and play many roles
Why the Research Matters

2,376,407 Individual Lives (this page x 24)

“Most students do not reach a defined goal, and less than half who enrolled in a California community college campus left with a degree or certificate or transferred after six years. Achievement gaps that fall along lines defined by race and ethnicity persist at unacceptable rates.”

— CHANCELLOR ELOY ORTIZ OAKLEY

- 1.9 million CCC students not ready for college
- 2.4 million enrolled CCC students (AY 2016-17); 1.1 million FTE
- CCC students amassed about $200,000,000 in ed. loans AY16/17
- $5000+ per year to support one FTE
- 38% of dropouts do not return; 30% must still repay student loans
- Student-to-counselor ratio 611:1
- 56.4% of CCC courses taught by full-time faculty
Full-Time Faculty & Student Success Rates

• Full-time faculty devote substantially and proportionally more out-of-class time to student learning than part-time faculty. A referenced study differentiates between cost savings and cost effectiveness.

• A national trend of increasing reliance on part-time faculty correlates to a national reduction in graduation rates.

• Freshmen who have many of their courses taught by part-time faculty are less likely than other students to return as sophomores.

• Part-time instruction in introductory courses fails to adequately prepare students for additional classes in a sequence taught by a full-time instructor.

• Part-time faculty consistently grade higher than full-time faculty.
Faculty by the Numbers

• Nationally, in 1969, part-time professors comprised 18.5 percent of the workforce, a number that has grown by more that 300 percent to 75.5 percent of the instruction workforce.

• The number of employees hired by colleges and universities to manage or administer people, programs and regulations increased 50% faster than the number of instructors between 2001 and 2011. Systematic disinvestment is transforming higher education into a private good.

• An extensive survey conducted by CAW resulted in nearly 20,000 respondents and the following key findings. Over 80 percent had taught part-time more than three years, half more than six, and 75 percent were desirous of full-time tenure track position.
Workload

Full-Time Faculty

- Five classes minimum (median 25 students per class) for full-time
  - Currency in pedagogy, subject, technology
  - Prep time, Conferencing, Assessing Student Work,
  - Student clubs and organizations
- **AB 1725** responsibilities & professional demands are in a near vertical climb
  - Local governance
  - Curriculum
  - Programs development & reviews
  - Accreditation
  - Institutional planning & budgetary priorities

Ironic: low faculty employment ratios + increases in accountability = 

*reduced student contact*
IF the System, Legislature, and Accreditors are serious about raising student achievement levels, they will provide support for:

• The initial goal of 75/25

• Inclusive incentives for part-time faculty

Funding that increases the presence of faculty in the lives of our students would translate into stronger accreditation findings, more student-centered faculty time, reduced class sizes, improved counselor ratios, individualized instruction, and an increased potential for faculty and students to have a shared college experience, the very formula for **STUDENT SUCCESS!**
Faculty are not the problem. Faculty will help you solve the problem.  
(WASC Academic Resource Conference 2015, Keynote, Haycock)

• Why am I here?

• ASCCC Disclaimer / ACCJC Disclaimer

• Institutional/Leadership Attitude

• Ian’s Broader Perspective – Student Success

• Original Conversation with Jonathan Lightman – Evidence?
What’s this got to do with Accreditation? - #1

✓ Narrowly Nothing – non prescriptive

✓ Broadly Everything – demonstrate improvement

✓ **Standard II.A.2** – Faculty ensure professional standards
  ✓ Faculty act to improve instruction & student success
  ✓ DoE bright lines on Student Success / ACCJC Annual Report

✓ Use ideas from this paper to demonstrate improvement
What’s this got to do with Accreditation? - #2

- Paper shows evidence that full-service faculty-student interactions are the key to success
  - With full-time or enhanced part-time faculty

- Standard III.A.7 and 8
  - Sufficient number of qualified faculty (FT and PT)
  - Opportunities for integration of PT faculty into life of institution

- Use ideas from this paper to demonstrate improvement
Recommendations to Improve Student Success

Given that the literature identifies student/faculty interaction as an essential component of student success, the paper recommends the following:

**Two Complementary Goals**

✓ **Increase Full-Time Tenured Faculty Positions**
   Benefits:
   • Dedication to maintaining the quality of a single institution
   • Continuity & integration of programs, curriculum, & resources (instructional & student support)
   • Institutional memory for effective governance & institutional improvement
   • Support for the ongoing work of meeting expanded accountability requirements

✓ **Increase Support for Part-Time Faculty**
   Benefits are all of the above contingent upon:
   • Proportional compensation for office hours & governance participation
   • Compensation parity to eliminate the need for “freeway flying”
Whole Group Discussion

- Increase meaningful faculty-student contact
- What could you do right now?
- What could your college do right now?
- With funding or without funding?
Thank you!
Get the paper at faccc.org