



## **Enrollment Management Committee**

May 16, 2008

Room 2205, 12:30 p.m.

### **(Approved) MINUTES**

**Present:** Kevin Ankoviak, Jeff Baker, Neal Ely, Nicole Huber, Bob Kratochvil, Pam Luster, Amber Machamer, Marge Maloney, Philip Manwell, Jason Morris (Chair), Thomas Orf, DeRionne Pollard, Sylvia Rodriguez, Michael Sato

**Absent:** Brian Hagopian, Martha Konrad, Laurel Jones, Birgitte Ryslinge

**Guest:** Greg Daubenmire, Justin Garoupa

---

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 12:32 p.m.

**2. Set Agenda**

Agenda was approved as written.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

(T. Orf/P. Manwell) to approve the February 29, 2008 minutes as written.

Approved: unanimous

**4. DEMC Update/Enrollment Update**

Mr. Morris informed everyone he has been updating LPC BINS data, and distributed a handout consisting of detailed information and explanations. He explained that BINS are designed to compensate for costs to LPC and Chabot that are not part of the FTEF allocation model. Sometimes they are also known as "high cost programs." The BINS highlighted were: Sheriff's Academy, Physical Education, and Vocational Programs. He went on to announce that Dave Fouquet reworked LPC's figures and has raised the allocated FTEF number from 435 to 438. Initially, Mr. Fouquet had lowered it to 433; however, after negotiations, raised it to 438. It was unclear and unsettling as to why this occurred without prior LPC consultation.

Inquires were raised regarding the change in LPC's FTEF allocation without input by the LPC Enrollment Management committee, and the dynamics of DEMC meetings; specifically, pertaining to who chairs the DEMC and how voting occurs.

It is believed no voting currently occurs; information is passed down from either Tom DeWit and/or Dave Fouquey.

President Pollard reported several concerns regarding current processes; specifically noting there is a feeling of allocation imposition by both the DEMC and Chabot regardless of the data LPC produces. One reason for this might be due to the fact that consistent data, formulas, and communication among all parties is not occurring. The Committee talked about improving dialogue at the District and college level. Dr. Machamer commented briefly on the “disconnect” between all parties.

The committee discussed Sheriff's Academy funding and the current allocation model. Dr. Ely explained current funding processes and indicated we are due to negotiate our contract with the county next year; it is probable they will ask for an increase in funding. He perceives the issue to be in figuring out how to best remove the academy from the allocation model. Vice President Kratochvil commented on various budget issues and concerns, citing a flawed allocation model and formulas.

Mr. Morris continued to report on the methods he used to calculate BIN numbers for the Sheriff's Academy. The formula of 1 FTEF at a cost of \$70,000 annually was used. There was confusion as to whether or not this figure is accurate. Vice President Luster indicated the average cost for part-time and full-time faculty needs to be calculated accurately and plugged into the allocation model. The problem we experience repetitively is the lack of consistent numbers to work with. She suggested the Chancellor be contacted for the information. Mr. Morris indicated he will be seeking three (3) additional FTEF for next year. He is concerned with the PE WSCH/FTEF figure of 590; he would like to see it lowered to 560. In conclusion Dr. Ankoviak commented on the allocation model and timeliness of distribution. He stressed a discussion regarding meeting FTEF goals should be occurring.

**5. Construct Process for adding sections to previously approved Discipline Plans**

Dr. Ely reported deans have received requests to add sections to approved discipline plans. The committee discussed whether or not a process should be constructed to allow this. A ranking process was suggested, similar to that of the PBC. Division members could rank and forward a listing to this committee for review and approval. Vice President Kratochvil reminded everyone that LPC will once again be approximately \$400,000 - \$500,000 short this year and we have already allocated based upon previous assumptions.

**6. Outline Discipline Plan Guidelines for 2009/10**

Mr. Morris proposed getting a head start on the discipline plans by distributing them at Convocation in August. Questions arose as to whether or not we should

be planning for no growth, should the roll-over be the same as it was in 08/09?, and should we be planning for the possibility of paying back the roll-over? The assumption is our FTES target will be 7200 for 09/10, unless we are informed otherwise.

**7. Rollback Discussion**

The committee discussed the possibility of creating and implementing a process, as borrowing shouldn't continue to occur. It was felt increased dialogue and guidance from the District is necessary to form a strategy. A discussion regarding allocation model concerns and impacts ensued. The committee overwhelmingly felt we must receive our allocation earlier so accurate planning assumptions can be made. With so many figures being tossed around, it is imperative that accurate data for all parties be provided. Vice President Luster noted the "worth" of an FTEF still needs to be accurately determined and reported consistently by all organizations. Consistency in the formulas and model are imperative if we ever plan on breaking the cycle of paying back rollovers and other debts. Unfortunately, due to the amount of inconsistency; planning and analysis has been flawed. It was suggested the committee start working more closely with Chabot and the District to improve dialogue and data analysis.

**8. Good of the Order**

It was announced Mike Sato will not be on the CEMC next year. Justin Garoupa will be replacing him. Mr. Sato was thanked for his efforts and work on the committee.

**9. Adjournment**

No further business was discussed and the meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m. The next meeting has not been set.