

**Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**  
Office of Educational Services and Planning

**Meeting Notes**

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, February 4, 2011

10:30 – 11:45 am

District Office – Multipurpose Room

- I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes - December 3, 2010
  - II. Enrollment - Reports
  - III. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets
  - IV. Other
  - V. Next Meeting – February 23, 2011
- 

**Attendance:** Joel Kinnamon, Kevin Ankoviak, Celia Barberena, Rita Brown, Tom deWit, Neal Ely, Dave Fouquet, Kathy Kelley, Bob Kratochvil, Guy Lease, Lorenzo Legaspi, Pam Luster, Thomas Orf, Sylvia Rodriguez, Dale Wagoner, Laura Weaver

**Handouts:**

- 1) Agenda
- 2) Meeting Notes – December 3, 2010
- 3) Allocation of FTEF by FTES 2011-12 (Base 9,961)
- 4) Allocation of FTEF by FES 2011-12 (Base 9,491)

**I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes – December 3, 2010**

Mr. Fouquet reported that the discussion of lab load factors on page 4 was confusing and not accurate as to what he said. After a discussion, no change was made.

Dr. Lease requested that on page 5, paragraph 2, the sentence should read: “Dr. Lease reported that the cost or impact of over enrollment would be to Student Services as we are not able to provide the support that our students need.”

Dr. Lease requested that on page 5, paragraph 4, line 2, Proposition 98 “fees” should be changed to Proposition 98 “guarantees.”

Dr. Luster requested to delete the second sentence on page 2, under Section II, paragraph 1.

Ms. Weaver made a motion, seconded by Dr. Lease, to approve the minutes of December 3, 2010 as corrected. Motion carried.

## **II. Enrollment Reports**

Mr. Legaspi reported that the District received its “recalc” apportionment for the 2009-10 fiscal year. The report shows the total funded and unfunded FTES. The District’s total FTES was 18,815.64; funded at 16,780.15 and unfunded at 2,035.49.

Dr. Kinnamon noted that the challenge is that we are currently higher than when we started our enrollment management.

Mr. Fouquet questioned how many of that was non-credit FTES, to which Mr. Legaspi reported 141.15.

### Chabot:

Mr. Wagoner reported Chabot is at 11,200, which is approximately 1,100 over target. He reported that CEMC has cut 60% of summer over 2 years ago and 10% less than last year. They are looking at 39 FTEF, from 69 two years ago. He reported that they picked up an unanticipated 200 FTES from Contract Education. Fill rate is approximately 105%.

### Las Positas College:

Dr. Orf reported that for Spring Semester Productivity is 541 and Total FTES is 3205. LPC is at 7,158, which is 157 over target. Fill rate is approximately 95%.

## **III. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets**

Dr. Kinnamon distributed corrected copies of the December 3, 2010 Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2011-12. He noted that in the handout of December 3 the totals were incorrect because of the lab load factor.

Mr. Legaspi reported that the reduction to community colleges is \$400 million, and in addition, we are supposed to get funding of \$110 million to fund 1.9% in enrollment growth. Of that is \$290 million reduction. He reported that there is direction out there to call it what it is and look at the net reduction of \$290 million. The League has been running simulations as to what that means for our District. If you were to take the \$290 million and projected decrease of approximately 5% to our District, or approximately \$4.2 million or approximately a 934 FTES workload reduction.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that it is likely that in the final budget rather than funding for growth, it will be as a workload reduction instead, which is a more honest approach as to what is taking place.

Dr. Kinnamon explained that the front side of the handout showed where we are today:

	FTES Target:	Allocated FTEF
Chabot -	10,041	603.3
LPC -	7,001	411.5
District Total -	17,042	1014.9

The backside shows where we would be if they did workload reductions:

Chabot -	9,491	570.4
LPC -	6,617	389.1
District Total -	16,108	959.4

Mr. Fouquet requested clarification of the 934 workload reduction, questioning if it factors in the proposed 1.9% growth. Dr. Kinnamon reported that the growth will most likely be taken away, therefore the number is absent any growth.

Mr. Fouquet questioned if this is based on the passing of the taxes, to which Dr. Kinnamon responded affirmatively. It was noted that it is a safe bet that we will not get any additional money.

Mr. Fouquet reported that there is conflicting information coming out of Sacramento. One message which is coming from Sacramento is that the community colleges need to improve opportunities for new high school graduates. How questioned how one can do that and have workload reduction at the same time.

Ms. Kelley suggested more feedback to the Governor would be helpful and believes the Governor is waiting for the human cry at the cost of other entitlements. In response, Dr. Kinnamon reported that in conversations with Bill Lockyer he believes that there will be more pessimistic news regarding state revenues and at this point it is unlikely to get enough votes to get this on the ballot. He agreed with Ms. Kelley, but until we get any constitutional referendums, "we are broke."

Mr. Fouquet stressed that we should not take irrevocable action until we know how this will play out. He has heard that there is still optimism that it will be on the ballot because they are not voting for the taxes but voting to put it on the ballot to let the people vote.

In response to the comment regarding improving opportunities for high school graduates, Dr. Lease expressed that we need to focus on the three priorities – transfer, basic skills, and CTE. It is his perception that what they are saying is to find a way to give people who are trying to register for a third repeat of a

repeatable activity course a lower priority and move the high school seniors up in priority. He expressed that it is a simplistic way of furthering the goal of narrowing our mission and getting back to being a junior college and preparing students for moving forward in a vocation or for transfer.

In discussing relooking at priority registration, Ms. Rodriguez expressed that currently units completed is the primary factor to determine registration priority, suggesting that we need to take a broader perspective.

Ms. Kelley reported that the policy limiting the number of Drops and “W” is not being enforced and is being discussed at Chabot. She noted that it is one of the suggestions out of the LAO to rethink the issue of repeats, and drops.

Ms. Kelley noted that a presentation by Ms. Yvonne Wu-Craig showed the new definition of CTE and may be one of the things we should take into consideration. It is no longer what we used to think as career technical education, it is much more expanded and includes eleven different disciplines and majors as part of career technical education.

Mr. Kratochvil noted that the scenario presented is a best case scenario and would not suggest waiting to take action until concrete information comes out of Sacramento as suggested by Mr. Fouquet. Mr. Fouquet responded that if we put a plan in place, we will need to make adjustments to it as “things play out.”

Dr. Kinnamon noted that we will be making adjustments to everything over the next six to twelve months.

Dr. Ely expressed that he fears that if we hold off making adjustments until more information comes down, we may be beyond summer and fall and everything would have to come out of spring.

Mr. Wagoner questioned if Chabot goes below 10,000 FTES how would it affect the dollars coming to the college. Mr. Legaspi reported that the SB 361 formula allows a one year reprieve for normal increases or decreases. However, he noted that this is not a normal decrease, it is forced upon us as workload reduction, and it would not be fair to districts. Currently, there is discussion at the Chancellor’s Office about indexing that threshold down or grandfathering colleges.

Mr. deWit expressed that 500 is a massive amount to make up.

Dr. Kinnamon noted that there may be places where there are lower cost FTES generators that help keep us closer to the 10,000 which are not reflected in the allocation, such as work experience FTES.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that Scott Lay corrected his numbers and we are looking at a 10.3 reduction. He reported that in the current year we have been so squeezed on operational costs, that our problem is actually bigger than 10.3.

At the request of Mr. deWit, the faculty broke for a 16 minute caucus.

Upon reconvening, Mr. deWit reported that the Faculty understand the seriousness of this situation and they know that “something has to give” in a certain timeframe. In their caucus, they discussed where and when and based on what information. They don’t have an answer to the question, and would like to meet again. It is his perception that if a decision needs to be made, the smartest thing would be to make it districtwide.

Mr. deWit questioned how, as we reduce the number of sections, to describe the savings all around that are strictly say to an adjunct faculty losing work. Dr. Kinnamon reported that he has made a list of savings which needs to amount to \$750,000. He reported that districtwide next year we will have fewer employees in all categories and at all sites.

Mr. deWit questioned if any full-time employee will lose their job, to which Dr. Kinnamon reported affirmatively.

Dr. Ankoviak suggested that if we are going to have to cut classes, we need to look at the State Chancellor’s memorandum and look at several disciplines. He expressed that we need to look closely at physical education as many of those courses do not fall in the criteria “coming down.” In addition, we need to look at sports programs.

Mr. Wagoner expressed that we need to look at basic skills mathematics and students with high priority numbers who repeat those courses. Mr. Wagoner expressed that the State Chancellor did not say eliminate physical education. Mr. Wagoner noted that “you are not going to do this on the back of Physical Education faculty without spreading it across the district in total without a real fight.”

Ms. Kelley expressed concern that students be able to complete programs. She continually hears that we have cut what we can logically and reasonably cut and if we start cutting more courses, it will impede students from completing and being what the state defines as successful, not what we define as successful. She expressed concern that this will hurt us in any number of ways, i.e. how we are perceived, our reputation, and our desirability for when times are better.

Dr. Luster stressed that it is not the role of CEMC or DEMC to decide the content of a discipline’s curriculum and how they offer it, but is the focus of faculty in consultation with their dean looking at how students complete the program. She

has asked Academic Senate to weigh in on what a comprehensive curriculum looks like. In a recent meeting with the LPC Curriculum Chair, Senate President, Articulation Officer and Transfer folks, somewhat related to 1440 and prerequisites, discussions have begun about how we can help faculty understand a comprehensive curriculum. When they are in a discipline and they don't necessarily know all the other disciplines, it's hard to compare when talking about being "gutted or obliterated." In your own discipline, you may feel it is obliterated, but in comparison to other disciplines, it may not be. She believes it is an academic discussion, philosophically and pedagogically, in terms of what a college offers. She does not want to do it by the numbers, noting that what typically happens is a dialogue about the value of the curriculum. She noted that we have a lot of degrees that no student ever earns. We have curriculum in and around the exterior that many feel absolutely have to happen, but may not need to be offered every year. She expressed that this is a broader discussion than CEMC or DEMC because now we are fundamentally changing the way our colleges look. She expressed that she believes we will need to discontinue some programs or hiatus some programs for a year. She agrees with the statement that we have not done a good job of "naming" the State Chancellor's challenge to us.

In response to a question raised by Mr. deWit, Dr. Luster reported that the group is moving rather quickly and will present a proposal to the LPC Academic Senate at its next meeting. She noted agreement with a comment made by Mr. deWit that we can't wait too long for dialogue to occur but she believes that the broader faculty need to be engaged.

Ms. Kelley noted that the Chabot faculty and staff are very pleased with how information is disseminated to them. One of the things she has attempted to do is share information she receives at the many meetings that she attends. One of the challenges of Dr. Luster's comments, is that the root of the whole issue is that everyone is overtaxed and undercompensated, that getting people to participate in even the most vital issues is becoming an unmanageable task.

Dr. Luster expressed that we can't force people to participate, but believes it is critical to communicate the importance of the issue. It is our role to figure out what the numbers are but the bottom line is that the disciplines will need to figure out what makes their program whole.

Mr. deWit questioned how we are going to do this, suggesting that the obvious thing is to eliminate summer session.

In response to a question regarding the timeframe for making a decision to eliminate summer, Dr. Kinnamon reported that it would have to be made soon, noting that if the colleges make that recommendation, he would need to make a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Fouquet questioned if summer session is cancelled, would there be twelve month employees that involuntarily go to ten months. Dr. Luster reported that it would be a reduction in force or a layoff and would have to be negotiated with SEIU.

Ms. Kelley noted this option would be a possibility of spreading the load rather than anyone losing their job.

Dr. Kinnamon noted that the challenge is the timing of everything, including the ballot measure, and some decisions need to be made by March 15.

Dr. Barberena voiced that she would not recommend eliminating summer session completely as we are a college and are here to serve students.

Dr. Ely raised the issue of furloughs as a way of reducing costs over anyone losing their jobs, and still maintain summer session. He noted agreement with Dr. Barberena in terms of if part of our focus is that we matriculate students through the system, summer is an important part for many of them. He also stressed that with priority registration, it is our students that we are serving.

Dr. Kinnamon suggested that where possible and with the proper skill sets, the District will try to reassign employees, but we still have to have savings take place. We need to understand our priorities and how we put people in places to support the vital services identified.

Mr. deWit questioned the message regarding the identified vital services, to which Dr. Kinnamon reported that he, the College Presidents and others are having conversations regarding what we are facing, our priorities and looking at our structure.

It was suggested by Mr. deWit that this group continue its discussion at its next meeting, March 4. It was suggested that perhaps the DEMC meeting could be moved up.

Dr. Kinnamon noted when the sheet (allocation?) was developed, it was understood that it was to be used as a percentage of distribution of available FTEF by site. He expressed that he does not know what the available FTEF will be at this time.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that he has always taken objection to the point of percentage. If there is to be a cut, it needs to be done with eyes open, and with the understanding of what the impact is on both sides of the ledger which is the point of shared governance. Dr. Kinnamon noted that he cannot show both sides of the ledger because he hasn't sent out March 15 letters yet, but noted that you can hold us accountable to the 50% Law.

Mr. deWit expressed that the point is how we can coordinate it to the dollar, simultaneously saving a half dollar in the same place. It makes the decision more arbitrary. If eliminating summer session saves fifty cents, we shouldn't do it.

Dr. Lease questioned if a decision could be reached as to direction for CEMC; perhaps at the very least asking CEMC to look at trying to make necessary cuts. He believes there is work that can be done at the colleges on trying to make plans on both the elimination of summer and also begin working on where to make the cuts.

Ms. Kelley suggested that DEMC meet again in approximately two weeks after concerted efforts are made to have discussions and perhaps decisions at the campuses.

Dr. Barberena expressed concern about not reaching an agreement today.

Dr. Lease questioned if the colleges could offer the option of voluntary furloughs without negotiations first. Dr. Kinnamon suggested that SEIU and the Board would have to approve this option first.

Dr. Kinnamon stressed that the reality is that we will get workload reductions from the state.

The question was raised if cancelling summer session is a Board decision, to which Dr. Kinnamon reported that it would be wise to give the Board an opportunity to have a voice on this decision.

In response to a question raised regarding the cancellation of summer session being districtwide or could it be a decision of just one college, Mr. deWit voiced that it would not make sense unless it was districtwide. He again suggested that unless it was a considerable savings, it would not make sense to do it. Dr. Kinnamon responded that the savings of cancelling summer session amounted to approximately \$2 million.

Mr. Fouquet reported that Summer Session 2010 cost the District \$1.8 million base, plus \$250,000 for the full-time differential.

Mr. Wagoner voiced that there are so many implications with summer that take more than two weeks to deal with, and it is not just deciding not to offer classes. He suggested it would be more reasonable to scale back summer and look at fall and spring to pick up the rest.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that we have this number that we believe will come from the State Chancellor's Office as workload reduction. He questioned the option of taking this number to the CEMCs and questioned their ability to absorb this.

Dr. Luster suggested that we could run scenarios with summer and without summer.

Based on these discussions, Dr. Kinnamon directed the Colleges to go to the CEMC's with the number we believe will be the workload reduction, and DEMC will meet again in approximately two weeks (February 23).

**IV. Other**

There were no other items discussed.

**V. Next Meeting**

It was agreed to meet on Wednesday, February 23, 2011, 3:00 p.m. (Additional Meeting)

Next Regular Meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 4, 2011, 10:30 a.m.

bb

Approved: March 4, 2011