# LAS POSITAS COLLEGE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE Minutes of February 24, 2012

Attending: Dr. Ankoviak (voting); Ms. Aubert; Mr. Baker (voting); Dr. Ely (voting); Mr. Kratochvil; Ms. Lee (voting); Ms. Miller; Dr. Noble (voting); Dr. Orf (chair, voting); Ms.

Rodriguez; Dr. Ruys; Ms. Scott; Dr. Weaver (voting); Ms. Inzerilla.

1. Call to order: 9:37 a.m. by Chair, Dr. Orf; Room 2460.

2. Approval of minutes of December 9, 2011: MSC – Weaver/Lee

## 3. Enrollment numbers for Spring Semester:

Productivity: 232 FTES: 2915 Fill rate: 94%

Regarding the over-reporting issue, Dr. Noble stated that LPC was only over anywhere between 81 and 84 FTES, and Chabot was only over between 52 and 54. Reports were corrected to reflect 130 FTES for the District. Dr. Orf stated that these corrections should be reflective in the SWOXEN report. Mr. Kratochivil and Dr. Noble wanted to acknowledge the hard work done in clearing up these errors by Sarah Aubert, IT staff, and Sylvia Rodriguez' office.

### 4. Budget situation

Mr. Kratochivil explained a handout supplied at the last Cabinet meeting to VPs, Presidents, Chancellor, and direct reports. Lorenzo Legaspi made the presentation and is supposed to supply a breakout of how much (cut) is expected by each college.

2011-12 projection is based on mid-year expenses. But a more thorough assessment has been done to see where the shortfall might be. For example funding for faculty is not based on the right average. Barbara Yesnosky has done her own analysis and the dollar average per hour for adjunct that the District has been giving us is much less than the actual.

The fee revenue is down based on the original estimate in the adoption budget. We are 1.4 million short as a district. In addition Scott Lay says we need to cut \$800K more which would put the district at \$2.2 million in the hole. There was very little discussion about how the district would resolve this other than the \$400K (LPC) and \$800K (CC) would be the responsibilities of the colleges. Not sure if the district will pick up adjunct funding. We are working with deans but have no clarity yet.

2012 -13 brings bigger issues. There will be structural deficit to the district if the tax initiatives fail. We would get less money and asked to do a workload reduction (cut back

classes). For the \$4 million and \$8 million, they will do a couple of scenarios and gives us an idea of what our share might be.

With summer construction projects (Boulevard Project handout) going on and there being many inaccessible areas to us and students, Mr. Kratchovil suggested a discussion occur regarding summer possibly being a means of reduction. The science project for example may provide the best time to reduce classes due to the non-availability of the buildings.

## 5. Priority Registration

Mr. Baker discussed how there is a misconception of who our students are. As such there are plans to look at making changes to the priority registration process as follows:

Priority group 09: (Title V) – DSPS, vets

Priority group 07: students who completed 4 components of orientation

Will now use units as a part of that priority as of Fall 2012

Priority group 07: 60+ units (3-matric) so our students are not penalized by no access

Priority group 06: 30-59.9 units (3-matric) Priority group 05: .3 – 29.9 units (3-matric) Priority group 04: 60+ no matric (2 or less)

Priority group 03: 30 – 59.9 no matric Priority group 02: .3 – 29.9 no matric

Priority group 01: Early admission (fall reg only)

Priority group 00: New and returning

Continuing students will be "grandfathered."

Dr. Orf led a discussion regarding the timeline of the schedule to print for summer and fall. Dr. Noble stated that significant decisions need to be made by mid-March; right after that the schedule goes to print. And once it's printed its usually already obsolete. What is usually current is on the web. The idea is to have as much done as possible by the end of March because it's easier to delete than to add.

Ms. Inzerilla shared that the Academic Senate's general feeling to cutting summer was no, but they didn't have the budget info. Online classes were discussed. There's some good dialogue going on with the faculty and deans.

More discussion ensued regarding Summer 2012. Handout – student enrollment by discipline for summer 2012. Dr. Noble gave some information regarding the headcount by student enrollment status from summer 2007 to summer 2011.

#### 6. Discussion of possible cuts for next year

CEMC Minutes February 24, 2012 Page 3 of 3

In order to discuss possible cuts we need data from the District meeting (DBSG) which is scheduled for next week (Friday, March 2). Dr. Orf suggested we meet again next week, after the District meeting.

**Adjournment:** 10:38 a.m.

Next Meeting: March 2, 2012 at 3 p.m.