

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

Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Wednesday, February 23, 2011

3:00 – 4:00 pm

District Office – Conference Room #1

- I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes – February 4, 2011
 - II. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets
 - III. Other
 - IV. Next Meeting – March 4, 2011
-

Attendance: Joel Kinnamon, Kevin Ankoviak, Celia Barberena, Tom deWit, Neal Ely, Dave Fouquet, MaryAnne Gularte, Bob Kratochvil, Guy Lease, Lorenzo Legaspi, Pam Luster, Thomas Orf, George Railey, Sylvia Rodriguez, Dale Wagoner, Laura Weaver, Audrey Ching

Handouts:

- 1) Agenda
- 2) Meeting Notes –February 4, 2011
- 3) Allocation of FTEF by FTES (2011-12)

I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes – February 4, 2011

After an initial review, it was agreed to table the approval of the February 4, 2011 Meeting Notes until the next meeting on March 4, 2011.

II. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets

Mr. Legaspi reported that on February 18, the Senate and Assembly Budget Committees met on the 2011-12 Budget and as reported by Jack Scott, the census date reform proposal was rejected by both committees. The proposal giving us \$110 million by increasing the fees to serve 1.9% more students was also rejected. Mr. Scott indicated that the League and Community College Systems Office was successful in making the case for workload reduction in proportion to the \$400 million cut, and taking the \$400 million and calculating the workload reduction based on that. The fee increases would be used to offset any cuts to our general apportionment. With that information, Scott Lay of the League calculated and provided to Districts what the \$400 million cut would translate to in workload reduction.

Mr. Legaspi reported that if the June tax fails and Proposition 98 is funded at the minimum, for the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, the \$400 million equates to approximately 1,404 FTES workload reduction. That amount was also broken down by District: 868 FTES for Chabot College; and 536 FTES for Las Positas College. Mr. Legaspi reported that if the tax fails, there is a very good likelihood that Proposition 98 will be suspended; and if that is the case, the workload reduction would mean 2,520 FTES Districtwide; 1,558 for Chabot, and 962 FTES for Las Positas College. Mr. Legaspi reported that the District is planning and developing our budget based on if the June tax fails and Proposition 98 is kept at a minimum, which in terms of budget reduction is \$10.3 million.

Mr. deWit questioned the difference between Proposition 98 being kept at a minimum and being suspended. Mr. Legaspi reported that Proposition 98 is a guarantee in terms of the level of funding for K-14. If it is kept at a minimum, it basically brings \$2 billion into the Proposition 98, and if it is suspended, it could mean almost anything.

Dr. Barberena questioned if fee increases are to be used to offset the cut, what it would mean for the system as well as for the District. Mr. Legaspi reported that the dollars are still the same; however, now the workload reduction is based on \$400 million and not \$290 million.

In response to a question raised by Dr. Barberena regarding fee increases, Mr. Legaspi reported that those dollars have been accounted for and we will get \$110 million systemwide. He reported that the net is \$290.

In response to additional confusion, Mr. Legaspi explained that we are still receiving \$110 million and our cut is \$290 million.

Dr. Lease tried to clarify the confusion by reading the following statement: "If the June tax package fails, and Proposition 98 is funded at a minimum the state general fund will be reduced by \$9,391,000 (our share of the \$400 million). The increased student fees would offset that by \$1.66 million for a net reduction of \$7,775,000 (including the fee). The \$7,775,000 equals the total FTES of 1,404."

Dr. Lease explained that if you divide the \$7.7 million divide by what we get for FTES, you come up with 1,404 FTES.

Mr. Fouquet suggested that until the directive comes from the State Chancellor's Office, we should not formalize the cuts.

In response to Mr. Fouquet's suggestion, Mr. Legaspi read a statement from the State Chancellor, Jack Scott. "They also agreed with our insistence that the workload of community colleges be reduced in proportion to the \$400 million cut." Mr. Legaspi explained that this means using the \$400 million as the basis

for workload reduction, rather than the \$290 million. Based on that information, Mr. Scott Lay ran the simulations.

In response to a question raised by Mr. deWit regarding the calculations, Mr. Legaspi explained that the \$290 million was based on reduction in our FTES apportionment. The \$400 million is based on total apportionment, including the base amounts (below 10,000 FTES is \$3 million and above 10,000 FTES is \$3.5 million). If you take a reduction in your base apportionment, that adds additional FTES to the calculation.

Mr. Fouquet voiced that he believes it is premature to make a decision based on the assumption that the tax proposal will fail. He believes that it is still a possibility that it will get on the ballot and pass.

Dr. Lease voiced that if we were to move forward on the basis that the June tax passes, and it doesn't, then we are too late for planning purposes.

In response, Mr. Fouquet argued that we will know if it gets on the ballot earlier than June. He suggested having classes that can be "ghosted" in. And if it passes, the classes will be reactivated.

Dr. Luster reported that at Las Positas there is no way to "ghost" anything in as there are no shadow sections. They are down to single sections in many departments.

Mr. Wagoner voiced that we have already cut Summer and suggested that both Colleges plan on cutting Fall; and if it does pass, you can eliminate your cuts in the Spring.

Dr. Ely voiced that it will be difficult to staff a course that is a potential "maybe."

Mr. Legaspi voiced that the more difficult the financial situation, the more we have to be conservative and prudent and believes that is how this District has survived the past three to four years. He wouldn't plan on something passing in June, noting that that is not how you plan for a \$100 million budget. "That would be unreasonable." He voiced that even if we plan for \$10.3 million and the June tax passes, our problem is now \$7 million we are looking at \$3 million. He stressed that our structural deficit just to keep up with inflation and step/column is \$2.5 million. He shared the scenario that if we get \$3 million, that is just enough to fund next year's mandatory obligations.

Mr. deWit questioned if we go with cuts and follow Mr. Wagoner's suggestion of looking at the Fall and the June tax passes, would we be able to add classes in the Spring. Mr. Legaspi responded that it is better to talk about the money when we have it and to keep in mind that we have an ongoing problem - our structural

deficit. He was not suggesting that we don't offer classes, that is the first thing we should do. If voters pass the taxes, let's offer as many classes as we can. In terms of being able to offer classes in the Spring, he would say "yes."

Dr. Kinnamon voiced that it will be interesting to watch what the Chancellor's Office does with our targets.

Dr. Lease suggested that if the tax passes in June, we will be under intense pressure to increase the number of FTES and questioned how we would not do that.

Dr. Lease reported that the Las Positas College's CEMC meets Friday, February 25, 2011 and questioned if the direction is to "go back to the drawing board" and increase the reduction by another 152 FTES. The response was affirmative.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that since this is all based on whether the ballot measure fails, we need to also recognize that if it fails, there will be different directives coming from Sacramento. He reported that when you look at the LAO's list of suggestions, or projections of what things look like if the ballot measure fails, that included things like raising the fee to \$66 unit, terminating the Governor's subsidy of intercollegiate athletics, and changing basic skills instruction to non-credit. He noted that these things will not be easy to do and voiced that if the ballot measure fails, we will be hearing more about these suggestions, which will drive more discussions that we will need to have. In terms of what happens with regard to FTES, he stands firm on his position that it is too early to make decisions and cut classes. "We just don't know how this will play out yet."

Dr. Lease reported that at the last CEMC meeting they were of the consensus that the \$10 unit fee increase would not have an impact on enrollment because people need it so badly and CSU and UC are so expensive. He questioned what folks thought of \$66/unit. The discussion resulted in some voicing that it would make a difference while others voiced that it would not. Dr. Orf expressed that he believed we would see a different caliber of students and a lot of "rejects" from the CSU and UC systems; and believes the students that will be affected the most will be the high-risk or the low-skill students, and we will offer less basic skills classes.

Dr. Lease questioned the impact on the discretionary dollar, expressing that those who are life-long learners who take classes because they are interested, will drop out.

Dr. Orf expressed concern that a lot of students may go to the private institutions, which are incredibly expensive.

Mr. Fouquet voiced that the unit fee may not reach \$66, but may fall somewhere between \$36 and \$66.

Dr. Lease expressed that the unit fee increase brings in more income and may offset some of the additional cuts.

Mr. deWit questioned if we have to go all the way right now or could we go half way. He also requested that the minutes reflect that if the landscape shifts, if the taxes go through, or it doesn't and there are directives from the LAO, that we very actively revisit the implications and impacts of those things on FTES and on the schedule.

It was pointed out that the LAO doesn't give directives.

Dr. Kinnamon recommended that we continue to actively revisit FTEF every time this committee meets.

Mr. deWit noted that he requested the minutes reflect his recommendation, as it is very difficult to under these conditions and at this table where we are just talking about aggregate numbers, being nuanced about 10 and 20 FTES; and yet, that really matters as it is a lot of students. He posed the question two ways: Can we go half way; and maybe putting 10 FTES back on when the story changes is a huge deal. It may not feel like a huge deal because of our huge deficit, but it is a lot of students and a lot of classes.

In response, Mr. Legaspi reported that this is a directive from the State Chancellor's Office. He believes that there are not a lot of options at the State level, otherwise they would have given options. This is as close to a directive as you can get. He stressed that we need to get to our problem of \$10.3 million. He stressed that the harsh reality is that if it doesn't come from this, then it will have to come from another area.

Mr. deWit likened the college to a factory of students, and as they lessen, the factory has to shrink. He voiced that it can't shrink on just part-time faculty, there has to be shrinkage elsewhere. He noted that we are at a point where something more drastic has to happen somewhere else. He voiced that 1,400 FTES is massive.

Dr. Lease reported that at Las Positas College, they have quite a few vacant positions that they are not filling, including Administrative and Classified positions. He noted that they are looking at how to fill on an interim basis a Dean position. In addition, they probably will not fill on a permanent basis the position of Vice President of Academic Services, and continue on the current interim basis.

III. Other

There were no other items discussed.

IV. Next Meeting

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

bb

Approved: March 4, 2011