

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE  
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 25, 2011**

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

Absent: Mr. Baker (exc. voting), Dr. Lease (exc.)

Guest: Ms. Sarah Thompson, Academic Senate President; Dale Boercker

1. **Call to Order:** 9:36 AM by Chair, Dr. Orf
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Review and approval of the February 4, 2011, minutes tabled.
3. **DEMC Update:** Dr. Orf reported that the called DEMC meeting, February 23, had been a difficult one. The District is planning conservatively for a more than \$10M shortfall in anticipation that the Governor's proposal may either be defeated or not placed on ballot. While the overall state projections have not changed, the colleges have been directed to plan further reductions. The first directive reduced LPC from 411 to 389.1 FTE. LPC has now been directed to further reduce to 380.2 FTE (6,465 FTES); Chabot to 551.4 (9,173 FTES). Vice Chancellor Legaspi supports making this kind of "worst case" response because of the unpredictability of the outcome of talks in Sacramento and, if the special election is held, the outcome will not be known in time for appropriate reaction. The previous reduction to 389.1 was reflected in the discipline plans approved in December; since Wednesday the faculty have worked with the deans on further reductions forward and today's spreadsheet reflects this effort. The "first tier" meets the reduction to 389.1 (approximately 22.4 FTES reduction) and the "second tier" reduces nearly to the 31 total that would produce the further reduction to 380.2. While the spreadsheet may be further revised, the bottom line numbers will be held.

The group considered the relationship and the impacts of the local reductions and state projections. Dr. Ely observed that the projections have been largely agreed upon by different state entities, such as the Community College League and the State Chancellor's Office. The \$400M assumes that the Governor's proposal may fail or not be on the ballot, but also does not address the even more drastic possibility that Prop 98 could be allocated at minimum or even not at all. There is also no longer the language that a fee increase would come to the local college and into the General Fund; it "may show up there and it may not." If the \$110M fee increase (from \$26 to \$36/unit) were to be returned to the colleges through the General Fund, the \$400M would be offset to approximately \$289 or \$290, but our district is proposing to plan conservatively. Dr. Orf commented that he left the meeting "not sure what to do." Dr. Ankoviak hoped that the fee increase would come to the colleges.

In Ms. Thompson's absence, Dr. Luster credited her for fine leadership in creating the criteria by which the process was guided. Using Ms. Thompson's words "[t]his is an imperfect process" and not the way we would wish to work, Dr. Luster said, "I think the process in this period of time was as collaborative as we could make it." There were more reductions done in the first round than the 22.4 reduction required to make the 389.1, and the total now on the spreadsheet is very close to the 31 that are needed to reach the 380.2. And, as Dr. Luster continued, "What we stopped working on 15 minutes ago is still a work in progress; we are not all the way to the 380, but we are close." The recommendations have been made with an effort to see that college-wide disproportionate impact to any sectors has been avoided.

The Deans presented their division plans and explained how their faculty had worked together and with them to make these reductions:

Arts and Communication: Dean Manwell met with every coordinator and lead faculty and consulted with adjuncts where there were no full-time faculty. They “came up with what we believe is a reasonable FTEF reduction that least impacted students in each program.” As classes were removed or rescheduled, the division had come to see that there may be benefit in 2-1.5 year scheduling, a “forced issue” at this time. “They did an amazing job; there was no rancor. They all understood that it had to be done.”

Dr. Orf observed that the A&C had planned a heavier reduction in the fall; Dr. Manwell reminded the spring was planned on a spring schedule that had already undergone reductions over the last several years. All decisions, Dr. Manwell explained, were based on careful consideration of where there might be student need; the English discipline had been so generous in offering up sections that the decision was made to add back something that could serve more students (adding ENG 7 for summer).

Business, Computing, Applied Technology and Social Sciences: Dr. Noble echoed Dr. Manwell. She met with all her discipline representatives, and “every single one offered as much as I would have offered or more. Nobody was happy to give up [so much] but they worked deliberatively and with little rancor and for the benefit of students.” Dr. Noble also commented that the situation had “forced their hand,” and in some cases people took the opportunity to do something in the schedule that should have happened in the past; this schedule is a good reflection of what should and needs to be done. It meets the criteria. Dr. Noble said that there was “a bit of rancor in some areas” which she will address privately.

Ms. Lee observed that FACET classes have not been scheduled either for fall or for spring and wondered about future or alternate year scheduling. Dr. Noble had no information to give at this time.

Physical Education, Health and Wellness: Dean Miller met with “the faculty that do the discipline plans.” They looked at the schedule and at what they were asked to do and took that to the February division meeting, where they received feedback from those present. They then met again last Friday to work further on reductions. “They worked collegially; they don’t like it, but they still did it.”

Noting that this division had already taken 18% of the FTEF reduction, a total for PE of 4.7 FTE, a much larger percentage than required of other disciplines, Dr. Luster observed that this follows the reduction criteria from Chancellor Scott and expressed her gratitude for the cooperation in meeting this large number.

Dr. Orf and Ms. Lee questioned the number of Health section reductions since this is a graduation requirement and also a transfer course. Dr. Luster reminded that there are still many sections remaining in the schedule, and that, as we implement the SB1440 degrees, there may be less demand this course, which is a local option. Dean Miller reported that the division took that into account when the decisions were made. Ms. Lee also asked whether cuts to Intercollegiate Athletics were anticipated; Dean Miller said that there are no plans to do that. Dr. Luster added that she will continue her strong support for LPC Intercollegiate Athletics; no teams have been reduced at Chabot College.

Mathematics, Science, Engineering and Public Safety: Dr. Ely met with everyone: “Folks are not happy, but they understand that this is real.” Using the layers of criteria that came out of the Senate, he had explained that these were guidance but not as an absolute requirement. Faculty came up with “a good chunk,” basing decisions on “what made sense.” 9 FTE were reduced from the Sheriff’s Academy, but the Academy reductions are consistent with economic conditions in terms of people who would be taking an Academy.

Student Services: Ms. Tomlinson said that she might recommend other scenarios, but it would be a zero sum reduction of 0.6 FTE.

Because reductions have come very close to the 31.3 FTEF required, Dr. Luster recommended that we move to finish the summer schedule quickly: “Summer as already scheduled is small and now will be a little smaller.” Dr. Noble conveyed faculty concern about the timing of the print schedule and registration--some feeling it would be better to delay (printing, posting, registration) so that the posted schedule would give students the best possible information. Ms. Rodriguez said the dates of registration are fixed and published because of the limited registration window and for accommodation special populations, like early admission, veterans, etc., but we are already delaying somewhat. Ms. Lee suggested an April publication date in order to give students the best possible information. Dr. Luster expressed reluctance to wait until April, and Ms. Rodriguez said it is best to release summer soon “because it would be good to reassure students” that there will be a summer session. Group wisdom was that the summer schedule should be posted on the Web in mid-March; it will not be printed.—with one more CEMC meeting, a mid-March publication date should make the information as good as possible.

Ms. Huber agreed with the mid-March date, “people are already asking.” Dr. Noble was grateful for the discussion and understood the decision and rationale, but she had felt it should occur for the record. According to Ms. Boercker, the Senate had brought this up because they wanted classes that would not happen not to appear in the schedule, but also wanted only *definite* cuts to be deleted. Dr. Noble also asked whether we might consider not printing the fall schedule at all to allow for change throughout the summer. Ms. Rodriguez said that, while students have adjusted to not having summer schedules in print and are adjusting to having a reduced number of fall schedules printed, “we must have some printed schedules because students still ask for them.” Dr. Luster’s opinion was that we would hold off printing the fall schedule as long as we could; she asked whether fall printing plans are underway at this time. Ms. Rodriguez said she is using a timeline and schedule similar to our “usual” one. The idea was put forth that the printed schedule might not need so much detail in class descriptions or notes, but Ms. Lee said that students need and want this information, especially online. While Chabot is putting out a newspaper schedule, our booklet version costs approximately the same; Dr. Ely felt that our version is more helpful for students. Dr. Luster said that some things are just “better to have so that students have better questions when they come to counselors.” Dr. Noble thanked the group for the thorough discussion for the record. Dr. Ely reminded that this decision is based on the situation “as we know it and as it could be impacted.” Dr. Weaver said that the greatest impact of last-minute cancellations will be on special populations such as DSPS and Veterans, but their priority should allow them to get the class they need.

Dr. Luster summarized, although there is no guarantee that if the tax proposal goes through, it will come back to us and there is also no guarantee that if we received additional dollars, the District would put any FTE back on the schedule, but this appears to be a good collective decision; we can move forward to try to put together a schedule that is real. By June students are already registered for fall, and, as Dr. Orf agreed, with summer and fall schedule

“put to bed” before that time, any FTE returned to schedule would need to be put back in spring.

Dr. Ankoviak questioned why there is not more cutting to summer because that would bear a reward in differential pay savings and fewer adjuncts cut. Dr. Luster reminded that this process has been a faculty decision “where they looked at their own programs and made their recommendations.” Dr. Ely said that he would not wish to return to the faculty for further deliberation on the summer schedule. MOTION: Dr. Ankoviak moved *to go back and make the proposal to the faculty that they make more cuts in summer. There being no second, the motion died.*

Dr. Orf asked whether the spreadsheet information is ready to be communicated to DEMC. Dr. Luster said that we could report that “with less than 1.0 FTE of additional tweaking, we are there.”

MOTION: Dr. Ely moved that the *CEMC Committee release the spreadsheet, with the information that this is the result of discussion and collaboration and is where we are for summer, fall, and spring—the full picture at this time—with the caveat that the situation is still unknown in Sacramento. There is the potential to add back or to cut further, but [the process] has been taken seriously and deliberatively this far.*

Ms. Lee asked whether she should amend the motion to recommend that all the cuts be made from Tier 1 first, and then from Tier 2, wondering, if funding became available, how/what would be the process [for restoring]? The group decided that it would be better to have a separate motion. Dr. Weaver seconded the previous motion, *and the motion as stated above was passed unanimously.*

Dr. Orf observed that this committee approves discipline plans and as this decision is going to change the discipline plans, faculty should be asked to resubmit discipline plans for CEMC approval. Dr. Noble cautioned all that, in the revision, the rollover schedule should be carefully reviewed so that anything not in the plans is deleted. MOTION: *MSC (Ely/Lee) moved that the Committee request new discipline plans reflecting the cuts we just asked to be implemented.*

MOTION: *Ms. Lee moved that all cuts in Tier 1 be done first and, if need be, reductions continue with Tier 2.* DISCUSSION: How long would we wait to do Tier 2? Would we have to reduce all of Tier 1 before making any reductions in Tier 2? Dr. Luster explained that some classes in Tier 1 were moved into Tier 2 “as a decision” because the reduction at the Tier 1 level had been more drastic than required to meet the 389 FTE, so it is not clear whether there an absolute distinction could be made about what would be a Tier 1 versus a Tier 2 reduction. Dr. Ely supported viewing the terms Tier 1 and Tier 2 as guides: “My guess is it doesn’t matter how, [but] do we put it back, if it gets better?” Dr. Ankoviak said spring would be the only option for putting anything back into the schedule [based on the State’s schedule for the ballot in June]. Dr. Orf recommended that we leave that decision for now and, if we are able to add back in, we will go back to the faculty. There being no second, the motion died.

In conclusion, Dr. Orf said he definitely wanted it down in the minutes that he commends the faculty on their accomplishment. Dr. Luster also repeated, directly to Ms. Thompson, now present, her earlier remarks: “Sarah, I thanked you at the beginning of the meeting” for leadership in bringing the Senate to consensual agreement on the guidelines and criteria with which the faculty had worked through this difficult task.

The group decided that with the work accomplished today, they would not need to have the next scheduled meeting on March 4 unless something were to emerge from the DEMC meeting.

The meeting will remain on calendar and will be cancelled "on a moment's notice." Dr. Orf will inform Ms. Konrad, who will send an email to the committee by noon March 4

4. **ADJOURNMENT:** Dr. Orf adjourned the meeting 10:27 AM, expressing his gratitude to everyone.
5. **NEXT MEETING:** CEMC March 4, 2011 (if necessary) following DEMC meeting. DEMC and CEMC meetings April 1.

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad