

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 1, 2010**

Attending: Dr. Ankoviak (voting); Mr. Baker (voting); Dr. Ely (voting); Ms. Huber; Ms. Konrad; Dr. Lease; Ms. Lee (voting); Dr. Luster (voting); Dr. Machamer; Dr. Manwell; Ms. Miller; Dr. Noble (voting); Dr. Orf (chair, voting); Dr. Weaver (voting)

Absent: Mr. Kratochvil; Ms. Rodriguez; Ms. Tomlinson

1. **Call to Order:** 12:36 PM, by Chair, Dr. Orf
2. **Approval of Minutes:** *MSC (Lee/Weaver) to approve the Minutes of September 17, 2010 meeting.*
3. **DEMC Update—Dr. Orf:** At a special DEMC meeting, Friday, September 20, 2010 called by Chancellor Kinnamon to clarify the funding amount that the colleges would receive through adopting the various levels of productivity (WSCH/FTE). At that meeting both colleges adopted a compromise 527.5 WSCH/FTE (LPC 406.7 FTE). Acting on the outcome of the most recent CEMC meeting, Vice President Luster worked with the deans on the required cancellations. As of today's date, Las Positas is scheduled to 406.5 for Spring 2011 (very close to the actual assigned 406.7 FTE).

Dr. Lease spoke to his CEMC memo sent immediately previous to this meeting in which he described how the outcome of the special DEMC meeting had intersected with the outcome of the September 17 CEMC meeting, at which the 4 to 4 tie on adopting the 530 WSCH/FTE target had resulted in a request for him to break the tie. He further explained that implementing the DEMC decision "as proposed" with the resultant \$130,000 supplement to the current budget would help to address the anticipated college budget shortfall of approximately \$300,000 this fiscal year. Additional budgeting and planning difficulties are created by the lack of a budget yet in Sacramento and the hints that budgeting provisions may cause the new governor in January to revisit the budget. Dr. Lease cautioned that our Board of Trustees may be "caused to take a more conservative position on the allocation of revenue to the colleges."

4. **CEMC Procedures:** Dr. Ankoviak requested that the CEMC procedures draft and discussion be tabled per the request of the Faculty Association pending contract negotiations and language that they are placing "on the table." Tabled to following meeting.
5. **Discipline Plans:** Dr. Orf presented the 2011-12 Discipline Plan guidelines and timeline as the primary focus of today's meeting.

Moving forward on the 406.7 FTEF and based on "planning to the nose...we won't have the final DEMC information until November and we won't have more," Dr. Luster remarked that, if we cancel anything, we risk not meeting the 7001 FTES target unless productivity holds at or near the current level. As of today, classes are scheduled to 406.5 and the print schedule is going into production now to meet the registration dates for Spring.

Dr. Ely agreed that it is a difficult situation, and complicated by not having the State budget. He recommended that the college plan to use same FTEF we now have for this year, 406.7, and use the same guidelines for scheduling that we used for this year, including Chancellor's Scott's directives. Much of this planning has already been done since this is the "fourth iteration" of cuts for 2010-11.

“Big” disciplines are largely already prepared to do their schedule, but “small” disciplines will find the decision more difficult as even the reduction of one section is a disproportionate impact, but “the important thing is to begin.”

Dr. Orf asked whether the group could proceed on consensus or would need to vote on the assumption to schedule for 2011-12 with a beginning FTEF will be 406.7, as currently scheduled for 2010-11, and using the basic guidelines for 2010-11. Consensus was to proceed.

Dr. Ankoviak informed the group that the Faculty Association intends to “hold to the contract 525 FTE and to “pressure [the Chancellor] not to go over 525 for planning purposes.”

Dr. Ely spoke of the \$300,000 deficit still projected for the College even though there is to be a backfill for the 4s, 5s, and 6s and said he would rather “err on the side of the higher 527.5 as the starting point for next year.” Dr. Orf noted that 527.5 should not become a “benchmark” for Enrollment Management planning; Ms. Lee suggested calling it a “point of departure” for planning and not a benchmark. Dr. Luster felt it would be helpful to emphasize scheduling the FTEF and to let faculty know that the college should not “schedule more than we have this year” rather than emphasizing “productivity.” Ms. Lee, too, agreed that faculty would be better served to focus on FTEF and not productivity.

Summation of the discussion was that the College will “hold the line, allowing scheduling changes within the allotted FTEF, but not additions—based on what went into the schedule and not the discipline plans, including classes that were canceled”

Dr. Lease asked how the FTEF would be apportioned throughout the year, whether there would be an estimate for summer and then the remainder split equally between the two terms. Dr. Machamer observed that, even for this year, there is potential for mid-year cuts, and, possibly, rollbacks.

Past practice has been to schedule more heavily for fall, and Dr. Ely supported continuing that practice because student interest is generally and historically higher in fall, with not as many mid-year entries. Dr. Orf noted the nearly 12 FTEF that make this Fall more “top-heavy” than Spring. 2011. This was, according to Dr. Ely, also because we scheduled a small summer last year and had more to put in fall, not just because we also made additional cuts for spring.

Although there are no DEMC decisions yet about summer, it will be necessary to begin work on Summer 2011 fairly soon. Ms. Huber encouraged working on summer before winter break, and faculty working on fall before they leave in May. Dr. Orf noted that many community colleges, possibly most, had cut summer completely. CLPCCD kept it, but made it a smaller summer. Dean Miller observed that many colleges that made the decision to cut summer are now “chasing FTES.” Dr. Luster’s question was whether we could make our target without a summer session, and she and Dr. Ely also noted, with Ms. Huber’s concurrence, that this would be virtually impossible because of facilities limitations.

Referring to his previous statement about holding to the contractual 525 WSCH/FTE, Dr. Ankoviak said faculty would take issue with further class reduction when other sectors are not being reduced in the same proportion. Dr. Lease explained that the \$52,000/FTEF figure often quoted as “funding instruction” is not the totality of the college budget and that his problem with the 50% law is that costs cannot be so differentiated across the whole college. Dr. Ankoviak admitted to an incomplete understanding of the funding mechanism of the college and promised to meet with Mr. Kratochvil

to learn more about this, but said that, if, in the unlikely event that the DEMC were to allocate more FTEF to the college, that should be used to put more classes on the schedule. Dr. Lease questioned whether it would be advisable to add those classes back without regard to the services needed to support them, in view of the already predicted \$300,000 shortfall for the year. Dr. Ankoviak's view was that "the faculty have seen cuts and cuts and cuts and have seen nothing on the other side of the ledger," pressing for an accounting of expenditures in the 4s, 5s, and 6s.

Ms. Lee commented that, as a counselor, she has felt the effects of these reductions very dramatically on behalf of the student services that have been reduced; drastic cuts are not only in instruction. Drs. Luster and Lease called attention to the many other, institutionally important services without which no comprehensive college can function, and the reality that many of these services have been paid for from categorical funds which also have been drastically reduced.

Dr. Ankoviak acknowledged the difficult decisions facing the college, explained that the frustration he and other faculty are expressing is less directed toward the college than toward the district, and asked for assurance that, should any additional FTEF be allocated for the college, the decision of how to use these FTEF will be brought to the CEMC.

Dr. Machamer said that she interpreted the Faculty Association arguments as indicating a lack of caring about the institution as a whole. Dr. Ankoviak said he was not speaking for the Faculty Association but about the 300 emails he has received.

All agreed that it is highly unlikely that additional FTEF will become available at this time or in the foreseeable future, but Dr. Orf gave Dr. Ankoviak his guarantee to involve the faculty in any decisions about application of additional FTEF.

6. **Discipline Plans/EM Tool/Timeline:** Extensive discussion about the EM Tool led to creation of a subcommittee to review both EM tools (the Sato tool and the Jason Morris spreadsheet) to consider which would be forwarded this year or whether both might be of some advantage. Dr. Orf's hesitation in moving to "The Sato Tool" would be that he has been trained by Jason Morris, and he would need to be educated in "The Sato Tool" before Wednesday in order to be able to send out guidelines and directives for faculty planning. Dr. Ankoviak recommended that the enhanced laboratory load factor be taken to DEMC to see how it will be handled next year.

Adopted CEMC Discipline Plan Calendar:

October 6	CEMC Guidelines to be sent out to Full-time Faculty
October 29	Faculty to submit Discipline Plans to Division Deans
November 5	Review (not course by course) Summer 2011 DPs; CEMC meeting 2:00 p.m.
November 19	Review (not course by course) Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 DPs; CEMC meeting beginning 9:00 a.m. and continuing until finished.

7. **Adjournment:** 1:47 p.m. by consensus.
8. **Next meeting:** October 15, 2010, if/as needed. Dr. Orf to determine whether the meeting is needed, based on outcome of October 8 DEMC meeting.

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad

.