

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE
COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 17, 2010**

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. Machamer; Dr. Manwell; Ms. Miller; Dr. Noble (voting); Dr. Orf (chair, voting); Ms. Rodriguez; Ms. Tomlinson; Dr. Weaver (voting)
Excused:

1. **Call to Order:** 12:34 p.m. by Chair, Dr. Orf; Room 2490. Agenda reordered to reverse #3 (Productivity) with #4 (CEMC Procedures).
2. **Approval of Minutes:** *MSC (Lee/Ely) to approve the Minutes of September 3, 2010 meeting.*
3. **CEMC Procedures:** Dr. Ankoviak presented a flow chart draft of "the process by which the [CEMC] does its work," developed primarily by him in response to Faculty Association concern about implementation of discipline plans and the way cuts are made. He had based the flow on "my recollection of the way the Committee worked, at least when I was on the Committee (2008-09)." His intent is to have a set of procedures that will be in place "for the future" to assure that faculty will be consulted under the guidelines of the contract. He elaborated that, last year, when cuts were determined for 2010-11, including the "no colloquia" decision, a number of faculty came to him expressing their feeling that, although they were able to come to the CEMC, they believed the decision had already been made. The intent of the contract with regard to Enrollment Management is to incentivize faculty to translate increased productivity into increased pay. Since there is no increased pay to be achieved through increased productivity, faculty have asked why they should do the extra work and why not let the deans do [enrollment management] the way we did it ten years ago.

Dr. Ely commended Dr. Ankoviak on the draft and supported it as helpful to the EM planning, while asking for careful language, paralleling the contract, especially where "boxes" at the end of page 1 address how to handle non-agreement. Dr. Ankoviak said that he had not used the contract when he drafted this document, but felt that the procedures reflected "the spirit" of the contract. He recalled when the CEMC had imposed a higher productivity on Biology and hoped, though defining procedures that would work for both agreement and non-agreement, situations like that could be avoided.

Dr. Ely reminded that the guidelines for reducing sections were prompted by Chancellor Scott's October memo that clearly defined community college priorities to be followed, i.e., Career/Technical, Basic Skills, General Education courses for Transfer, courses that support degrees/certificates. Dr. Machamer spoke to CEMC primacy in establishing the guidelines, but remarked that, within the guidelines, not all decisions would be made in Committee. Also, the Committee has never kept faculty from coming to CEMC "if they feel they need to make a case. They have never not known what was going to be presented here."

Dr. Luster highlighted the need, first, to receive “some confirmation of the depth and breadth” [of what we need to do] and advised placing the flow chart “on top of what is explicit in the contract.” She also requested that, when “strong voices” are raised against issues, they would bring this to the CEMC, possibly in writing. In terms of Chancellor’s Scott’s memo, she noted that colloquia would not necessarily meet these aspects of the community college mission in an environment of reduced FTEF.

Dr. Ankoviak expressed his opinion that the CEMC is out of compliance with the contract by not giving productivity goals to the disciplines. Reminding that the flow chart is a draft, he asked for feedback from the group.

While not a voting member on CEMC last spring, Dr. Weaver stated that she had attended a number of the meetings and specifically the one when the colloquia had been discussed. She recalled the discussion over colloquia and whether to offer them or not had been extensive that day and the decision a very difficult one. Although she did not know specifically what had been brought to Dr. Ankoviak concerning colloquia, Dr. Weaver emphasized that her dean, Dr. Noble, has always involved faculty with the decisions on the courses to offer, reviewed her decisions with division faculty, and they had come to consensus.

Dr. Orf voiced his frustration at not being kept apprised of changes in this rapidly moving landscape. He felt that his credibility with faculty suffers when he takes forward his understanding of the situation and facts, but then discovers that he has been operating under the wrong assumptions or criteria because the situation has changed or different directives have been received. “[It is only] going to get worse. I would have more confidence [in the process] if we set up procedures, [including] step-by-step procedures [for making decisions].” Dr. Luster again emphasized the need to lay this flow chart against the contract, and Dr. Ankoviak agreed that he would expect people to do so. Mr. Baker and Dr. Noble, both involved in contract negotiations this year, also appreciated the effort, while also supporting Dr. Luster in her emphasis on a careful comparison with contract language. Dr. Lease asked that the procedures provide more language “in the bottom box of the bottom half” where it addresses CEMC voting on the final discipline plans and asked for the flow to address a YES vote, a NO vote and recommendation to the President.

Dr. Orf will email the draft to the group at the close of today’s meeting; Dr. Ankoviak invited response, recommendations, and feedback for a revised draft.

4. **Productivity:** Addressing the issue of adopting a further raised productivity WSCH/FTE , Dr. Orf asked Mr. Kratochvil to report whether he had looked into the actual dollars that would be recovered and applied to the “4s, 5s, and 6s.” Mr. Kratochvil said that, as expected, the amount would actually be half that on the table or approximately \$88K, but that could be doubled if the 530 WSCH/FTE were adopted. Dr. Orf said the Chancellor has also offered the adoption of “in between” increments. Dr. Luster presented and commented on her proposed scenario to meet a 530 WSCH/FTE and reframed the discussion “less to a WSCH/FTEF than to a FTEF reduction.” The Chancellor has directed LPC to reduce 3.5 for spring, Chabot 4.5; annualized, this becomes 7.0 FTEF

for LPC and 9.0 for Chabot. Comparison of the actuals and the plans, including some recovery of FTEF from QUEST going to Community Education, and a number of other small FTEF coming available, it appears that to reach a target of 405.2 FTEF, Spring would have to be reduced by 5.63 FTEF. Using that figure, she has applied reductions by division based some reductions already having been made. CEMC would need to develop the guidelines for making the reduction and deans would work with division faculty to apply.

Mr. Kratochvil said, adopting this scenario, the College would still fall approximately \$250,000 short for the year although there are some things still possible in the State budget and District assumptions that can ameliorate the budget situation this year. Dr. Weaver asked how Chabot is meeting their reductions. Dr. Ankoviak reported that they are not planning to take the higher efficiency, but Dr. Luster said this may have changed from two weeks ago and her understanding is that they will adopt the higher productivity. Dr. Luster also reminded that this decision is entirely within the control of the colleges.

Ms. Lee asked about whether the funding for enhanced lab load has been factored in. Dr. Ankoviak reported that Chabot has a SWOXEN detailing the impact of the lab load factor and requested that this report be obtained for LPC. Ms. Huber said there is no SWOXEN that can break that out, and that calculation would need to be made manually. Ms. Huber and Dr. Luster also explained that, because this lab load is not accounted for in the plans, appearing only in the actuals, it is really not necessary to know how the college will receive the funding this year and the funding can be applied to actual expenses when the money is received.

Dr. Orf asked the Deans for comment. Dr. Ely noted that “we are in the fourth round of cuts to 2010. We’ve done the low-hanging fruit, and it appears that there is nothing easy to do. When we are loading the operating budget at 22% of last year, [we need more in the 4s, 5s, and 6s]. While we don’t want to cut classes, we must also provide a quality education experience to the students we serve. We may assume that there are some things in the offing with the state budget, possibly elimination of negative COLA and adding a small amount of growth (possibly the 2% instead of the anticipated 1.8%), but we need to do this.”

Dr. Ankoviak expressed concern about how this additional District funding, paid for by reductions to instruction, would actually benefit instruction. Dr. Orf’s question to Mr. Kratochvil was to ask why the budget had been loaded in at 22%. Mr. Kratochvil explained that this was the amount of money after salaries and wages were accounted for and that this percentage was loaded across the entire budget in all lines and accounts. Non-discretionary items have grown to take more and more of the total budget, leaving a lower percentage for discretionary costs. Although it is anticipated that transfer of monies from a number of one-time funding sources will assist in getting through this year, next year’s budget cannot be similarly supplemented.

Dr. Manwell spoke about how painful everyone finds these decisions, “especially in small disciplines where there are no alternate sources of funding, but as painful as it is to make further reductions, we need to make them.”

Dr. Noble observed that it is good “to hear that other deans hate this as much as I do. In my division, when I bring back a recommendation, those decisions are faculty driven. We talk about how we will get our target met--this is done respectfully and done together—and then [the decision becomes] part of the bigger picture.”

Dr. Ely agreed that a further reduction “is painful, but we can figure out how to do this across divisions.”

Dr. Orf made a “quick comment” that he attributed the deans’ reversal of their previous position to a meeting or meetings to which he had not been privy. He thanked Dr. Luster for their brief meeting this morning, but said he needs to be kept fully apprised in this rapidly changing situation when the CEMC is asked to make such critical decisions. He recalled a situation last year when he had come to a CEMC meeting fully prepared to vote one way, but, hearing updated information, changed his vote; he is concerned that close communication between administrators and himself as CEMC chair will be even more critical to the process this year.

At this juncture, Dr. Ankoviak stated that he had been instructed by the FA President, Ms. Charlotte Lofft, to inform the CEMC that the FA will formally protest to the Chancellor specific lines in the budget; e.g., that 2100 and 5100 lines have grown disproportionately while the 1100 line has been cut by 10% over the last four years.

Dr. Lease described how 16-18 months ago when there were major funding cuts, colleges had had some capacity to cover. Even making reductions, this District still ended 1,400 FTES over funded CAP. Now there is nowhere to cut except to reduce the CAP and for the colleges to reduce the number of students they can serve.

Dr. Orf has been telling faculty that he would work with them toward a reduction of approximately 25 classes—but with no state budget yet and the rumor that negative COLA may be eliminated and a small amount of growth added, “we’ll have to see what happens.” Dr. Orf also said that his frustration is not with people but with process. He is concerned that, because of his teaching schedule, when he is unable to attend key meetings, such as College Council, he may not be included in essential discussion and communication.

Dr. Ely agreed about the importance of clear communication, but felt that if the state budget does not include the 2% growth or eliminate the negative COLA and the situation further exacerbated, these will be separate issues. Dr. Luster promised to “make sure [Dr. Orf] is in the loop.” She added that there are literally new developments every day. For example, it was thought several weeks ago that if the College went for a WSCH/FTE of 530, with the District of \$176-177,000, that would come close to meeting our needs, but now that would still be short. She recommended that criteria be set as quickly as possible and percentages assigned by division or whatever other mechanism is established by CEMC.

Dr. Ankoviak called for the question, clarifying that this would mean, “Are we going to make these cuts [as outlined in Dr. Luster’s scenario]?” The motion would be to vote on reducing the FTEF

target for 2010-11 to 405.2 FTEF, with the District funding of \$176-177,000. Ms. Lee asked where the enhanced lab load funding would figure into this decision. Dr. Noble asked for consideration of "ramification of what happens if we don't." Dr. Weaver asked how deep a cut this would be. Dr. Orf explained that the difference essentially would be to take the 408.5 FTEF, agreed upon several weeks ago, which already has courses identified to meet that target, down a further 3+ FTEF. The number of sections cut would depend on what classes are cut. Taking the reductions to the 405.2 level (530 WSCH/FTE) would give the College an additional \$176-177,000 to apply in other areas. Dr. Orf reminded that the decision to adopt the 525 WSCH/FTE level (408.5 FTEF) had general approval, but that to go to 530 is a big step.

Dr. Ankoviak asked about where the additional \$176-177,000 would be applied and would it go directly to instructional operating expenses. Mr. Kratochvil's comment was that without this supplement, the College will be required to make up nearly \$450,000 for the year. There is currently no money for the Sheriff's Academy (\$95,000), the Student Services Credit Card process (\$75,000), hazardous waste removal (\$30,000), among others. Dean Miller said that all the deans could add specific information about their divisions. Dr. Ankoviak asked for a specific amount to be applied to Biology, to Chemistry, noting that the examples given did not show that any money directly applied to instruction. Mr. Kratochvil responded that he could not provide the exact figures at this time, and Dr. Ankoviak said that, if he didn't know how much would go to Biology, how much to Chemistry, his response should have been to say that "we don't know."

Dr. Machamer and Dr. Ely emphasized that some costs must be incurred by the institution that are not directly attributable to classes, but Dr. Ankoviak's continuing concern is for cuts to be applied disproportionately to "one side of the ledger." Dr. Orf also raised the issue of whether the vote should be on the number on the table, 405.2 or should the CEMC consider some increment between.

Dr. Lease spoke of institutional costs, some of which are not optional. To meet those costs, cuts will have to be made, possibly unilaterally. [The decision to adopt this higher productivity would help by providing nearly \$177,000]. Not supporting this decision because the money would not be applied directly to instructional operating supplies (e.g., Biology supplies or chemicals for Chemistry), according to Dr. Lease, "seems difficult philosophically." Dr. Weaver spoke of the frustration of seeing people going on trips, conventions being attended, while we cut instruction. Dr. Lease said that, if those examples are problematic, they are also examples of what is not going to be funded this year; if last year was an example of poor spending, that is past. We also do not know what further difficult decisions will be needed for next year. Dr. Weaver agreed, but also felt that "decisions like this shouldn't be made in one hour."

Dr. Orf called for the vote on the motion on the floor to adopt a target of 405.2 FTEF (equivalent to 530 WSCH/FTE). Votes were four YES: Baker, Ely, Luster, Noble; NO: Orf, Ankoviak, Lee, Weaver. The vote resulted in a TIE, with no recommendation for cuts and producing a procedural recommendation to President Lease to make the decision.

Dr. Ankoviak encouraged adopting provisional criteria to accommodate Dr. Lease's anticipated decision, but Ms. Lee recommended waiting to see what the decision is and what those cuts would be when applied across the divisions. *Consensus at the end of discussion is that, depending on the outcome of Dr. Lease's decision and recommendation, deans will work with their faculty to make decisions by division.*

5. Good of the Order:

- Dr. Orf again expressed his gratitude and that of the Committee to Ms. Konrad for her support.
- The Committee sang "Happy Birthday" to Dr. Ely, whose birthday is today.

6. Adjournment: 1:49 p.m. by consensus.

7. Next meeting: October 1, 2010. Discussion on the tasks at hand indicated that the meeting scheduled for October 1 should take place.

Recording Secretary: Martha Konrad