

PCS President's Report to the PCCD Board of Trustees for September 25, 2012

David Reed

Thank you Mr. President. Good evening trustees, chancellor, college presidents, colleagues and members of the public.

My name is David Reed, President of the Peralta Classified Senate and Laney Outreach Specialist. I'm here to advocate for the establishment of baseline fte staffing ratios throughout our district. I've included for the record a copy of a document from the U.S. Dept. of Education that provides an example of staffing ratios, I've also provided an electronic copy to the Board, Chancellor and Board secretary.

Why should we act on this, and why is this a priority? This is about institutional effectiveness and it's about meeting our accreditation requirements. Currently there are no data or clearly stated guidelines for fte staffing that are being shared in a participatory governance environment. This is critical to institutional effectiveness because our ability to deliver services and successfully matriculate students depends on having adequate staffing levels. Our ability to plan and be efficient depends on this information. In regards to our current accreditation status, the ACCJC was very clear in their language in recommendation #5, and here is a partial quote:

"The colleges responses in the upcoming reports should include an analysis of staff sufficiency and the quality of educational programs before and after budget reductions..." ACCJC Peralta Action Letter July-2-2012

It does not make sense to have data and guidelines regarding fte faculty ratios but nothing for classified staff. In terms of planning, hiring prioritization and resource allocation this is equivalent to flying blind and it does not drive good decision making processes.

Let's be proactive. We have plenty of examples of the negative outcomes from districts that chose to wait or not act when they had been warned, and we should also keep in mind the metaphor of the 3-legged table. Administration, classified, and faculty are the three main constituent groups in terms of paid personnel, and yet one group, classified staff, seem to be the only category with no established guidelines in critical areas such as staffing. We need all three legs to hold our table up.

This concludes my report.

Respectfully,

David Reed

David A Reed, M.S. Ed

Outreach Specialist, Office of Student Services

President, Peralta Classified Senate

Building A, Room 102, Laney College

900 Fallon St, Oakland, CA 94607

(510) 464-3537

dreed@peralta.edu

<http://www.laney.edu/wp/>

http://www.laney.edu/wp/classified_senate/

Table 257. Number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff and faculty, and FTE staff and faculty/FTE student ratios in public degree-granting institutions, by type of institution and state or jurisdiction: Fall 2009

State or jurisdiction	Full-time-equivalent staff				FTE faculty				FTE faculty as a percent of FTE staff				FTE students per FTE staff				FTE students per FTE faculty			
	4-year		2-year		4-year		2-year		4-year		2-year		4-year		2-year		4-year		2-year	
	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff	Total	Staff
United States	1,868,956	1,449,825	419,131	621,181	422,776	198,405	29.2	47.3	5.8	4.5	10.3	17.3	15.3	21.7						
Alabama	38,534	32,149	6,386	11,531	8,509	3,022	26.5	47.3	5.2	4.2	10.3	17.5	16.0	21.8						
Alaska	5,418	5,260	158	1,769	1,721	47	32.7	30.0	3.7	3.7	2.3	11.3	11.4	7.8						
Arizona	35,263	24,281	10,982	11,406	6,429	4,977	26.5	45.3	6.5	4.8	10.4	20.2	18.1	23.0						
Arkansas	21,720	17,047	4,673	6,700	4,671	2,028	27.4	43.4	5.2	4.4	8.4	17.0	15.9	19.3						
California	191,529	130,158	61,371	68,510	35,491	33,019	27.3	53.8	7.7	4.5	14.3	21.4	16.7	26.6						
Colorado	32,978	27,484	5,495	13,926	11,316	2,610	41.2	47.5	5.6	4.8	9.8	13.3	11.5	20.7						
Connecticut	16,331	13,431	2,901	5,338	3,682	1,656	27.4	57.1	5.5	4.3	11.3	16.9	15.6	19.8						
Delaware	6,621	5,339	1,282	1,959	1,338	621	25.1	48.4	5.0	4.3	7.9	16.8	17.0	16.3						
District of Columbia	802	802	0	303	303	0	37.8	†	4.5	4.5	†	12.0	12.0	†						
Florida	75,190	63,892	11,297	25,183	20,493	4,690	32.1	41.5	7.2	6.7	9.8	21.4	20.8	23.6						
Georgia	55,812	44,195	11,617	17,342	11,948	5,394	27.0	46.4	5.9	4.9	9.5	18.9	18.2	20.4						
Hawaii	8,127	6,402	1,725	3,057	2,204	853	34.4	49.4	5.0	3.7	9.7	13.3	10.8	19.6						
Idaho	8,439	7,101	1,338	2,897	2,351	546	33.1	40.8	5.8	5.6	6.9	16.9	16.9	17.0						
Illinois	72,555	51,375	21,180	21,001	11,854	9,147	23.1	43.2	5.6	3.5	10.8	19.3	15.0	25.0						
Indiana	47,569	42,907	4,662	15,113	12,578	2,534	29.3	54.4	5.3	4.4	13.6	16.7	15.1	25.0						
Iowa	25,636	19,370	6,267	7,959	5,340	2,618	27.6	41.8	5.1	3.3	10.7	16.5	12.0	25.6						
Kansas	25,655	18,837	6,819	8,873	6,041	2,831	32.1	41.5	5.2	4.4	7.4	15.1	13.8	17.9						
Kentucky	33,695	27,829	5,866	10,261	7,456	2,805	26.8	47.8	4.9	3.7	10.4	16.0	13.9	21.8						
Louisiana	30,347	26,381	3,966	10,053	7,950	2,103	30.1	53.0	5.6	4.7	11.6	16.9	15.6	21.9						
Maine	6,610	5,543	1,066	2,280	1,673	608	30.2	57.0	5.6	4.7	10.0	16.2	15.7	17.5						
Maryland	41,629	29,780	11,849	15,944	10,518	5,426	35.3	45.8	4.9	4.1	7.0	12.9	11.6	15.3						
Massachusetts	29,113	21,847	7,266	9,592	6,467	3,125	29.6	43.0	5.4	4.3	8.8	16.5	14.7	20.4						
Michigan	72,383	58,761	13,622	25,190	18,592	6,597	31.6	48.4	5.6	4.3	11.2	16.2	13.7	23.1						
Minnesota	33,738	25,862	7,875	11,542	7,718	3,824	29.8	48.6	6.0	4.4	11.2	17.4	14.6	23.1						
Mississippi	28,715	22,057	6,657	7,754	4,723	3,031	21.4	45.5	4.6	2.9	10.1	17.1	13.8	22.2						
Missouri	38,492	30,730	7,762	12,466	9,112	3,353	29.7	43.2	4.8	3.8	8.9	14.9	12.8	20.5						
Montana	7,597	6,634	963	2,439	2,045	395	30.8	41.0	5.1	4.6	8.0	15.8	15.1	19.5						
Nebraska	17,079	13,959	3,121	5,496	3,994	1,502	28.6	48.1	4.6	3.5	9.5	14.3	12.3	19.8						
Nevada	10,168	9,603	565	3,469	3,181	287	33.1	50.9	7.2	7.0	12.2	21.2	21.0	24.0						
New Hampshire	6,690	5,060	1,630	2,422	1,470	952	29.0	58.4	5.2	5.2	5.2	14.3	17.9	8.8						