

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
APRIL 1, 2011**

Attending: Dr. Ankoviak (voting); Dr. Ely (voting); Ms. Huber; Ms. Konrad; Mr. Kratochvil; Ms. Lee (voting and proxy Weaver); Dr. Luster (voting); Dr. Manwell; Dr. Machamer; Ms. Miller; Dr. Noble (voting); Dr. Orf (chair, voting); Ms. Rodriguez; Ms. Tomlinson (proxy Baker)
Absent: Mr. Baker (exc. voting), Dr. Lease (exc.); Dr. Weaver (exc. voting)
Guest: Ms. Sarah Thompson, Academic Senate President

1. **Call to Order:** 2:34 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** MSC (Luster/Noble) to approve the minutes of the February 4 and February 25 meetings.
3. **Discussion from DEMC Meeting:** Dr. Orf updated the group on the DEMC meeting held this morning. "In a nutshell" an FTEF reduction to 371.4 had been approved today at DEMC, based on a recalculation from the State and on the Chancellor's correction of the "bins. The 379 FTEF assigned to Las Positas had been based on the State's workload measures before the State determined that those numbers had been based on "faulty data." When the data were rerun, the new formula calculated the Las Positas FTEF at 371.4.

Dr. Luster explained the revised discipline plans that were being brought to the CEMC in today's meeting as having been reductions to the 379 FTEF, and, even those plans were "shy of the goal"; included in that FTEF was FTEF from the Academy in the "bins" and that FTEF factors at Las Positas under current scheduling standards only as a productivity accommodation and not as available FTEF. In order to bring the schedule down to 371.4 it will be necessary to go back to the deans and faculty. There is also a scenario where Proposition 98 would be suspended, and further reductions would be required to approximately 350.1 FTEF (5,970 FTES), and the Chancellor places that possibility at "about 50/50" to happen. This would go farther and might involve looking at programs.

A chart of summary information provided by Dr. Machamer showed that the reduction goal would take Las Positas to approximately where it was in 2006, another time of statewide economic stress.

The questions Dr. Orf posed to the Committee were "Which is the best way to do it (get down to 371.4)?" and "Should we do some kind of preliminary plan if we have to go to 350, with Proposition 98 suspended?" He advocated for creating this contingency plan. Ms. Thompson said that the Academic Senate had raised this issue; senators had requested that clear matriculation data be one of several guides used if we move to an "all cuts" budget. Dr. Machamer supported this as a good idea and said that she could look at what Rajindar has done at Chabot.

The consensus was that the plans should proceed from the current level toward the 371.4 FTEF reduction with cuts that have already been reflected in the Summer Schedule and implementing as many as possible for the Fall Schedule to prevent disproportionately impacting the Spring Schedule, where future reductions may have to be implemented. The concern is whether

incoming freshmen will be able to get a full schedule. Dr. Luster said that there has been a district wide decision to set a Banner/registration limit of 15 units for students to register online without seeing a counselor. It will be announced in the Class Schedule. This will help somewhat to mitigate problems caused when students sign up for classes they never intend to take. Continuing students will continue to think they can register for 18, but they will also be limited. The deans will continue to work with their faculty toward the 371.4, and are to come back with their fall cuts by next Tuesday, but there may be fall classes in the printed schedule that may be canceled.

Dr. Ankoviak requested that the CEMC receive the list of the fall and summer cuts on Wednesday after the deans report them on Tuesday.

Dr. Orf recommended that the Committee talk about the "blue sheet" (reduction to 350 FTEF, considered "all cuts") and the "green sheet." Dr. Luster did not support a conversation on the "blue sheet" at this time because we have not yet achieved the reduction to 371.4 (the "green sheet") and we do not know whether or when there would be a directive to go all the way to 350. Dr. Ankoviak suggested it may be necessary for CEMC to meet throughout the summer to respond to changing circumstances, particularly if there is new money (fee increase or state tax; reductions have been based on a fee increase to \$66; if the fees go to \$70, the cuts should be less). Drs. Orf and Ankoviak will both be unavailable during June, but both considered that emergency meetings could be called. Dr. Luster reminded that faculty had been promised they would have 3 semesters to look at the impacts of the cuts; we have not reached 371.4 yet and we should achieve that before moving toward further reductions. Consensus was to wait on conversation about the "blue sheet."

Ms. Lee asked about possible recommendations to close admissions. Dr. Luster reminded that Title 5 and Board Policy would have to be reviewed in order to take such action. There are "de facto" ways that limitations may be effected, as, for example, with discontinuance of assessment, students cannot register. Student Services will "have to be nimble" as it continues its services to students in this environment. Ms. Thompson asked for clarification about restriction of services when they have reach a "cap" and expressed concern about students having "no door" to their education. Financial Aid, for example, cannot cap its services, but, if a student cannot get classes, the student will not qualify for financial aid. Dr. Luster emphasized that Student Services are the appropriate ones to look at these student concerns and issues.

Dr. Ely observed that, while our major effort to date has been to look at Summer 11 and Fall 11, it may now make sense from an overall discipline structure to look at Spring 12 reductions. Dr. Luster felt it important not to prohibit faculty contact with their deans to make the best decisions. Dr. Manwell added that he and his faculty are doing that and proceeding as quickly as possible.

Consensus was that faculty should continue to work with their deans until the next CEMC meeting. Dr. Orf reserved the option to call a meeting should need arise. Dr. Noble reported to the Committee that the Surg Tech program is being moved to fee-based, which will free up 1.2 FTEF for Spring 12, along with the 1.4 that never made it into the fall 11 schedule. Additionally, the program for fee will probably generate funds for the college, as is happening with Pharmacy Technology, which has brought the college \$24,000 for one cohort. Ms. Lee asked for more information about the program from a counseling perspective; Dr. Noble asked for time to clarify exactly how the program will work as this is a new decision.

Dr. Orf asked the deans to send updated discipline plans in advance of the next meeting. It was also observed that with the Olympics next week and Spring Break to follow, the next Friday opportunity for a meeting would be on April 29.

4. **ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:05 p.m.
5. **NEXT MEETING:** April 29, 2011, 12:30 p.m. with a three-hour block to be reserved for approval of all revised discipline plans.

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad