

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 3, 2010**

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

Absent: Mr. Kratochvil; Dr. Machamer

1. **Call to Order:** 2:20 PM, by Chair, Dr. Orf
2. **Approval of Minutes:** MSC (Weaver/Lee) to approve the Minutes of the November 19, 2010 meeting.
3. **Update on DEMC:** Last year, Dr. Luster reminded, Chancellor Scott recommended that the community colleges focus their limited resources on Basic Skills, Transfer, and Workforce Training. This year a similar memo was received and discussed at DEMC and is being distributed at this meeting. The Chancellor has stated that his memo is to be taken as a recommendation, not a requirement. Dr. Luster remarked that, as we move into further cuts, “we are probably going to have difficult dialogue” about how to cut, the percentages, etc.

Dr. Orf observed that every person in attendance at DEMC this morning appears to have come away with a different perception; he gave his opinion that we should plan to go along with these guidelines. No direction on the memo was received at the DEMC meeting, nor was any action recommended. The allocation of 412.3 FTE (growth and enhanced lab load are included) remains for Las Positas College; but, although this has not yet been formally stated, the strong indication is that there will be no growth. There are also, based on state budget projections, indications that we may be required to make mid-year cuts. Dr. Luster emphasized that there has been no direction from the Chancellor that we must plan for mid-year cuts; she also cautioned that we must carefully observe the distinction between “mid-year cuts,” reductions that go into effect for the this year versus cuts anticipated for next year based on decisions that the new governor is expected to make when he takes office in January.

Dr. Lease predicted that “we’re almost definitely going to lose the growth money.” Dr. Orf emphasized that, although there are some things we can hold off on, “we don’t want to staff classes and then take them away.” He asked how the Committee would recommend working on the final 2011-12 Discipline Plans: whether to approve what we know now; whether to create contingency plans; how to work with CFS when the final scheduling decisions have not yet been made.

Dr. Lease suggested that the Committee move on the existing DPs to establish a base; and, after a base has been established, decisions on going forward with contingency percentages and planning scenarios can proceed. Dr. Ely supported Dr. Lease’s recommendation.

Dr. Luster said she wanted it known that these DPs were approved “based on our knowing what we know now,” and clearly communicated to those who had diligently worked on their DPs that changes may have to be made in response to statewide budget or district directives.

Dr. Ely thought that, considering the shortfall predicted for the current year, there is considerable likelihood of reduction, even for mid-year. Dr. Orf remarked that he has never seen so many classes closed this early in the registration period. Essentially, only specialized courses

or the more advanced or sequential courses remain open, and students are eagerly awaiting the drop for non-pay to attempt to register.

Dr. Luster noted that the 412.3 FTE may change (and probably will), but, based on the FTE we have scheduled so far, we appear to have a small cushion. She will schedule the CFS meeting soon so that those numbers are on the record for final DP approval in February. For 2010-11 to date LPC is scheduled for only a little more than 402, and we are meeting target for the present, so it would probably be appropriate to act on what we know and make additional plans when we "know the reality." What would be wise, however, at this time is to do a SWOXEN review and compare the DPs for 2010-11 with the current schedule as we begin to schedule a comparable FTEF for 2011-12.

Another factor, according to Dr. Lease, is the dramatic fee increase proposed by the new governor. It is not known whether, if enacted, there would be a significant decrease in enrollments. It will, according to Dr. Luster, be the largest ever seen in community college history, and there will be dramatic pressure on the amount of Financial Aid applied for. Dr. Noble questioned whether the increased application for Financial Aid could even be supported, and Dr. Luster agreed that, with the present level of support, it could not. Dr. Orf and Dr. Ankoviak raised the questions of how large the increase would be and when it would be enacted. \$35 per unit has been suggested as a fee increase for Spring 2011, which would have to be applied and collected retroactively, always difficult to do. A larger increase to \$42 per unit has been recommended for Fall 2011. The hope would be that, if fees are increased, the state would keep the current funding level and the fee increase would return to the college through the General Fund.

4. **APPROVAL OF DISCIPLINE PLANS:**

BCATSS: Per Dr. Noble, the numbers for BCATSS remain unchanged. Surg Tech will be in the bins, but will be included in the finals for the division discipline plans (the "380 bin status" means that the SURG program is not required to attain the institutional WSCH/FTE efficiency).

MSEPS: Dr. Ely reported that the MSEPS number for Fall 2011 has been slightly decreased from 130.88 to 130.15, based on removal of 0.73 from the Math plan; his review after last CEMC meeting had revealed that the Math Department had included that amount of FTEF for CFS.

PEHWA: Dean Miller reported a small decrease in FTE, from 30.6 to 30.59, based on schedule shift and alignment.

A&C: Dr. Manwell reported the A&C FTEF unchanged.

STUDENT SERVICES: Ms. Tomlinson reported schedule shifts that have created a small increase from 8.03 to 8.04 FTEF.

DISCIPLINE PLAN TOTALS:				
Division	Sum 11	Fall 11	Spr 12	Division Total for Year
BCATSS	6.26	48.5	49.86	104.62
MSEPS	11.5	61.71*	56.94	130.15
PEHWA	2.3	15.04	13.25	30.59
A&C	7.45	64.14	61.29	132.88
Student Serv	0	4.85	3.19	8.04
TOTAL	27.51	194.24	184.53	406.28*

*Current CFS FTE removed from total, pending meeting between Dr. Luster, Mr. Baker, and CFS faculty. Note also that the Fall 2011 FTE for MSEPS has been decreased upon removal of 0.73 FTEF CFS Math. The upcoming meeting will determine a final FTEF for CFS *in toto* and will be listed as a separate CFS discipline plan. The final institutional total FTEF will then be approved; this approval is anticipated at the next CEMC meeting, scheduled in early February.

MSC (Ely/Noble) to approve all 2011-2012 Discipline Plans, with exception of College Foundation Semester.

5. **PLANNING AHEAD:** Dr. Lease asked about the timeframe for moving forward to create contingency plans, i.e., how long can we wait? Dr. Ely responded that “[we] can wait as long as [we] want, as long as [we] are comfortable” with classes generically staffed in the schedule. If classes are selected to be held back with “staff,” there is a calculated risk that adjunct faculty will look to teach at other colleges, but, as Dr. Ely said, “we cannot be the only college in this [situation].” Dr. Lease reminded that the new governor’s budget may not be approved until August or September. Dr. Luster remarked that the faculty would prefer that a class not be offered to an adjunct if there is a likelihood that it would need to be canceled. Dr. Orf recommended that, as always, the deans use their experienced judgment in regard to staffing classes. Dr. Ely reminded that the Adjunct Seniority preference process is just now beginning for 2011-12 and only the summer schedule nearly finalized. Ms. Huber reminded that the reduced number of print schedules and the greater use of the web do allow more time for making these decisions. The autopay deadline two weeks before a term becomes the real staffing deadline, although last minute changes always occur. Dr. Ely observed that, until the second draft of the Schedule, however, there cannot be full confidence in class times, which makes it more difficult to extend offers. As the College is going “green” and students are becoming much more comfortable with the online schedule, there is more flexibility in dealing with staffing deadlines, Dr. Luster reminded. Dr. Orf said that we should be looking toward mid-March, then, as the time when we need to have removed classes from Fall 2011, if the schedule must be cut.
6. **DR. ANKOVIK CONCERN:** Dr. Ankoviak expressed concern that the CEMC did not address the issue of a possible change in efficiency, as had been presented to attendees at today’s DEMC meeting. He reported that the FA had met following today’s DEMC meeting and plans to respond their intent not to accept “the loss” of, possibly, up to 15 FTEF with the expectation that the faculty would continue to meet the current target. Dr. Orf said that he had not brought this as an agenda item because it is not, at this time, a formal proposal and has no specifics to be considered for a response. As Dr. Orf said, “I left with the impression that he [the Chancellor] wasn’t asking anything [at this time].” Dr. Orf, however, did indicate that, should a proposal with such numbers be received from the District Chancellor, he would not be able to agree. Dr. Lease and Dr. Luster said that they were not ready to accept the numbers “shown at DEMC” as a formal proposal. Dr. Luster said that if numbers such as these were proposed, “we’d bring it back [to CEMC] and deal with it.” To meet the current target with a reduction of so many FTEF would not be acceptable to anyone. Dr. Ely said his impression was that the Chancellor was offering “efficiency for efficiency” and supported waiting for the formality of the proposal.
7. **NEXT MEETING:** 2:30 PM, February 4, 2011, following the DBSG meeting. An emergency meeting can be called earlier if events or decisions require. Dr. Luster recommended that this year’s plans be reviewed with the schedule (SWOXEN) to determine why there appears to be a significant FTEF (nearly 10 FTEF) discrepancy between the 2010-11 plans and the current schedule FTEF.

8. ADJOURNMENT: 3:30 PM

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad

Attachment:

Memo from Chancellor Jack Scott

To: Chief Executive Officers
Chief Instructional Officers
Chief Business Officers

From: Jack Scott, Chancellor

Subject: Priorities in Class Scheduling

Date: October 28, 2010

Last year the Legislature lowered the enrollment cap in California community colleges by 3.39% given the harsh funding reductions that we suffered in the 2009-10 fiscal year. However, the Legislature further stated that it was their intent that community colleges make every effort to protect classes in basic skills, transfer, and workforce training. Specifically, the Legislature's guidance was provided in the 2009 Budget Act (Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009):

29. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges may reduce community college district base workload measures to match available funding under Schedule (1), which reflects a base reduction of \$120,000,000, and local revenues designated to support community college district general apportionments. It is the intent of the Legislature that community college districts, to the greatest extent possible, shall implement any necessary workload reductions in areas other than basic skills, workforce training, and transfer. On or before March 1, 2010, the chancellor shall provide the Legislature and the Director of Finance with a report on the implementation of this provision.

In reviewing recent enrollment data, it is evident that most colleges followed this direction and made fewer cuts in basic skills, transfer, and workforce training than in other parts of the class schedule. Yet, it is well once again to remind colleges of this legislative intent.

First, unless we take the lead on this matter, then one day the Legislature may become specific in what courses we should offer. One remembers the 1980's when the Legislature adopted a "hit list" that prohibited community colleges from receiving state funding for certain avocational courses. And we recall that last year the Legislative Analyst recommended that all physical education courses in our colleges be funded at the non-credit level. Fortunately, we were able to defeat that recommendation and prevent it from becoming law. But this still remains the view by some that we are offering too many avocational courses. We should take steps to avoid that vulnerability.

Second, it is clear that in times of scarce resources we have to prioritize. In 2009-10 it is estimated that community colleges turned away 140,000 students, most of whom were first time students. In times like this it is difficult to justify keeping a course such as aerobics for seniors while not scheduling enough classes in basic math or English. Under these circumstances the public will be upset when students seeking transfer classes or job retraining are turned away.

The recently adopted 2010 Budget Act provides community college districts with \$126 million to support an additional 26,000 full-time equivalent enrollments. These added resources represent an opportunity for community colleges to expand access to badly needed instruction in basic skills, transfer, and workforce training. As you consider how your district will use these additional funds, I strongly urge you to consider both the legislative intent and the pressing need to prioritize scarce resources, described above.

I want to be clear: This is a recommendation, not a requirement. The determination of which courses to offer is a decision made at the college level. This is the genius of our system: each college can determine the needs of its community. But I believe it is wise for us to take into account the intent of the Legislature and the general feeling of the public. It is good policy and makes sense for us to prioritize transfer, workforce training, and basic skill courses in these difficult times. We moved in that direction in 2009-10; let's continue that trend in 2010-11.