

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 4, 2011**

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

Absent: Ms. Tomlinson

Guest: Ms. Sarah Thompson, Academic Senate President

1. **Call to Order:** 2:41 PM, by Chair, Dr. Orf
2. **Approval of Minutes:** MSC (Lee/Weaver) to approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2010 meeting.
3. **Spring Enrollments:** As noted on agenda, 2010-11 targets have been exceeded by LPC and Chabot. Dr. Orf reported that district is now over cap by 2,000 students.
4. **DEMC Update:** Dr. Orf distributed “the numbers” received at DEMC today, both the “status quo” based on currently assigned FTES and FTEF and “the best case scenario” for probable reductions (assuming the Governor’s tax proposal were to pass). Meeting 6691 FTES, using 389.1 FTEF, could potentially equate to a reduction of 110 3-unit sections. There will be a special DEMC meeting on Wednesday, February 23, 3 p.m. to bring back plans of the colleges and look at district planning. Under consideration are whether to reduce by: 1) all of summer session; 2) part of summer and across the academic year. Dr. Ely remarked that a drop of 22.4% in FTES is about a 5% cut. A cut to that depth, Dr. Orf stated, would reach all the way to positions. He asked whether it was the will of the Committee to use today’s meeting to begin “hammering [plans] out” today and to go back [on February 23] with what we find out.

Dr. Luster observed that these numbers are only the “best as we know it today. When we know definitely what they will be, we will be so far into the schedule that it would be difficult to pull back.” She recommended that moving ahead and by the next meeting, we “come back with whatever we’ve been able to do.” A decision to cut summer session, Dr. Orf added, would certainly need to be done by then, with the summer decision also needing to be agreed upon by both colleges—and, Dr. Ely reminded, approved by the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Lease commented that the elimination of summer session “would take care of it” if we were to use the same numbers as last summer. However, in order to make that work, the school would need to be effectively “shut down,” and there is a real issue of whether that would be workable for all staff. The second scenario, reducing summer offerings, might be more possible as the remainder of the cuts would be spread throughout the year. Dr. Lease concluded, “So, I’m not sure it’s good to propose eliminating summer.” He also reminded that we do not yet know whether there will be a June special election; we do not know whether Proposition 98 will be reduced—we do know that this is the best it could be, but it could be worse. Dr. Ankoviak elaborated, “up to three times worse.”

Eliminating summer session, Dr. Luster acknowledged, would help with FTEF, but not with FTES; and, Ms. Huber emphasized, facilities are not adequate to handle all FTES generation within Fall/Spring semesters. Dr. Ankoviak said that, if 5 FTE were equated to \$125,000 and District

were to contribute that amount toward balancing the 4s, 5s, and 6s, as was done this year, he would not be so opposed to it as he previously was; the two issues to balance are the faculty reduction of classes and the college bringing costs down. Mr. Kratochvil explained that LPC has also done an internal \$1.8-\$2M "exercise" to handle its own shortfall for 2010-11, including salary savings from vacant positions, receiving \$400K from the Foundation (one time) and that these college efforts are not even represented in any of the charts shown at last week's Town Meeting by Mr. Legaspi.

In previous times of significant tuition increase, Dr. Lease recalled, community colleges have experienced decreased enrollment. But, Dr. Orf and others predicted, that will not happen this time because students are not getting in to UC and CSU and they will want to do their lower-division at community college. Dr. Weaver thought we would see a change in student demographics, but not in numbers. Ms. Lee reported that counselors are already seeing "high achiever" students coming directly from high school. Dr. Orf turned the discussion toward coming up with a "formula" to address the predicted situation.

Dr. Noble wondered whether focusing on DE might help for summer, as that could increase the workability of staff furlough days. Dr. Ely reported that, for those math classes this summer which are DE classes (and many of them are not), they still have on campus meetings planned for the face-to-face exams. According to Ms. Lee, some populations, such as veterans, would be significantly affected as they must have at least one face-to-face class to qualify for their benefits; Ms. Thompson reminded, however, that special populations would have priority registration, which would help them get that class. Dr. Orf's observation was that summer sections, if we offer "minimal classes," will fill rapidly. If we still keep summer session on a four-day class schedule, Dr. Noble observed that we might also close the campus completely on Fridays, with no staff working.

Dr. Orf asked how much the Committee would recommend to scale back summer. Dr. Ely spoke of Dr. Barbarena's extremely vocal opposition at DEMC in opposition to eliminating summer school, but the final decision does rest with the Board of Trustees; he recommended working holistically, looking at the big picture, making reductions for summer, but over all terms.

Previous reductions have been percentages assigned to divisions, but Ms. Thompson reported that the Academic Senate will not support "across the board" reductions and will discuss strategies for reduction, through developing criteria and asking faculty to identify the level of "necessity" for discipline core courses, with courses prioritized by their "uses," e.g., 1) part of major prep, transfer, and CTE; 2) CSU GE; 3) UC GE; 4) LPC GE. Discipline faculty, with their dean, would review their courses and identify those that "match all 4; match 3; match 2; match 1. Beyond the core courses, there would be secondary (UC Transfer); tertiary (CSU Transfer); and "everything else." It would be thought that those identified "everything else" may temporarily not be offered. The Senate could assist the discipline faculty to identify "what the core courses are." Dr. Luster reminded that this is a "work in progress," and that creating strategic criteria must take Chancellor Scott's memo into consideration. The college, as a comprehensive institution, must also consider where it will schedule "enrichment" and "activity" courses; and, Ms. Thompson noted, with moves such as the statewide move of Physical Education courses to a Kinesiology rubric, the issue of "activity" courses becomes less clear. Disciplines that have their own major also face an easier decision than those that don't, Dr. Orf observed. According to Ms. Thompson, here is where SB 1440 may be of some assistance. As the model curriculum for more disciplines continue to be developed, the faculty can consider whether an SB 1440 degree would

be feasible for their discipline. Ms. Alvarado is the college's liaison to the C-ID project and she will work with faculty to project what their CSU transfer model may look like.

Dr. Orf emphasized that faculty must be able to determine how to categorize their own courses, and Ms. Thompson agreed that this would be a "collaboration between discipline faculty and their dean to decide, but that there is little time, as decisions about course reductions must be made now. Dr. Luster concurred that this "definition" may be one of the things we do to strategize, but there are others, such as scheduling options (not so often, not as many sections) or institutional priorities. "Who decides which major is the most important? In CTE, for example, you have to be able to say who is getting employed." She reported that she has begun talking with the deans: "This level of scrutiny by faculty will be good for all of us." And, while something may be defined as "core," that still may not be how we schedule; Basic Skills, for example, would be difficult to schedule that way. Ms. Thompson agreed, acknowledging the Chancellor's advocacy for basic skills, although she expressed her opinion that, as is happening with categoricals, basic skills Math and English may have to reduce their feeder courses into college level. Dr. Luster stated her commitment to "not back away from Basic Skills until someone tells us to do that." In terms, also, of prerequisites, students would not have the preparation for regular classes and would have more difficulty in succeeding in their courses. "I don't think Basic Skills should take a disproportionate hit." Dr. Orf said he had noticed that current open sections appear to be heavily in basic skills classes, mentioning specifically ESL, which Dr. Manwell attributed to their late start scheduling to allow for assessment and then enrollment into the student's appropriate level.

Ms. Lee encouraged continuing to regard this as a "work in progress" especially since the strategies for course prioritization seemed to favor transfer "GE" courses. She also advocated for continued consideration for CTE courses, some of which are already on alternate schedules. Dr. Ely said that is already happening because major prep does include CTE.

Dr. Lease recommended that each of the three primary missions of the CCC, as identified by Chancellor Scott—Basic Skills, Transfer, Career Technical Education—have its own core and criteria. Dr. Luster expressed appreciation for Dr. Lease's approach, with the observation that "people like to see where they fit." Dr. Ely said that Math schedules approximately 2:1 "not transferable to transferable" ratio. Student Services, Mr. Baker said, tries to build courses that serve our students, some to fulfill matriculation components, such as Mega Day.

Ms. Lee asked, "What do we need for DEMC on February 23?" Dr. Luster said that we are expected to "bring back where we are." The process goes forward with deans in dialogue, deans and faculty working together—a multi-pronged approach. Dr. Orf agreed that this was his understanding. Dr. Weaver asked how new (added) programs should be viewed and whether "severe differences" between disciplines (such as class enrollments capped by contract) should be looked at. Dr. Luster reminded that the CEMC must separate the EM purview from issues that can be changed only as part of negotiations.

In conclusion, Dr. Orf asked whether there would be enough time for the deans to meet with their faculty and report back to CEMC before the February 23 DEMC meeting. Ms. Thompson announced that the Senate will do their model and give it to the deans by February 10. All agreed that the deans and faculty would work together on what to take to the February 23 meeting and that the CEMC would meet on Friday, February 25, 9:30 a.m.

5. SPRING MEETING DATES:

February 23, DEMC 3 p.m.

February 25, CEMC 9:30 a.m. (Room 2490)

March 4, CEMC 2:30 p.m. (Room 2490)

April 1, CEMC 2:30 p.m. (Room 2490)

6. INFORMATION TO FACULTY: Dr. Ankoviak encouraged that this information be sent to faculty immediately. It was decided that Dr. Orf and Ms. Thompson would send a joint communiqué soon after this meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT: 3:40 PM

8. NEXT MEETING: DEMC February 23, 3 p.m.; CEMC February 25, 9:30 a.m.

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad