

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

**Meeting Notes**

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, April 1, 2011

10:30 – 11:45 am

District Office – Multipurpose Room

- I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes – March 4, 2011
  - II. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets
  - III. Other
  - IV. Next Meeting – May 6, 2011
- 

**Attendance:** Joel Kinnamon, Kevin Ankoviak, Rita Brown, Neal Ely, Dave Fouquet, MaryAnne Gularte, Bob Kratochvil, Lorenzo Legaspi, Pam Luster, Thomas Orf, Sylvia Rodriguez, Dale Wagoner, Laura Weaver, Audrey Ching

**Handouts:**

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

**I. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes - March 4, 2011**

It was noted that Dr. Orf should be inserted in the two blanks on page 3.

Dr. Orf made a motion, seconded by Mr. Legaspi, to approve the minutes of March 4, 2011 as corrected. Motion carried.

**II. 2011-12 Enrollment Targets**

Dr. Kinnamon reported that he had received a phone call alerting him that the allocation sheet distributed at the last meeting did not include the bin update as provided by Mr. Fouquet; therefore, he distributed a revised sheet to include the bin update. Dr. Kinnamon noted that the adjustment changed the calculation by a couple FTES.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that he did not believe the update was correct.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that the Chancellor's Office and Scott Lay of the League met and re-calculated the numbers, which made them worse than what we were looking at – from a FTES reduction of 1404 to 1712. Dr. Kinnamon reported that

Mr. Legaspi will review the latest workload reductions from the state. He will also review this information at DBSG later today.

Mr. Fouquet stressed that when talking about reductions of FTES targets, it is important to define “reductions from what.” He noted that according to the P1, our base is 17,274, which is more than our old target of 17,041.

Mr. Legaspi reviewed the process used by the Chancellor’s Office and the League to arrive at the reduction. Mr. Legaspi reported that when we set our targets for 2010-11, we used 17,042. The question is “when we make the workload reductions, what do we use as a base to reduce from?” A discussion followed.

Mr. Fouquet expressed concern that we will not have enough FTES on schedule to make our current base. He also expressed that we will definitely see productivity go down. He also expressed concern that fees will continue to rise.

Mr. Legaspi reported that we know that fees will increase \$10 effective Fall Semester. He stressed that we need to deal with the information that has been given to us, noting that we have three scenarios.

For clarification, Dr. Kinnamon reported that the “green” allocation sheet he distributed is with a total reduction of 1712 FTES, which is the level without the ballot measure and tax extensions (does not include suspension of Proposition 98). He reported that suspension of Proposition 98 in the Governor’s Budget assumes fees at \$66/unit.

Mr. Fouquet pointed out that we have the uncertainty of the P1 growth and the possibility of a November election.

Mr. Legaspi expressed that at some point you have to stop and say these are the numbers.

Dr. Kinnamon noted that what you will see now is all Districts will shift their enrollment to address any growth that might be available to them.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that there is LAO maneuvering in Sacramento that could impact things—i.e. capping subsidized units, suspending or eliminating PE and Athletics, moving certain Basic Skills classes to credit/non-credit. He expressed that if cuts are made before all information is known, we are setting ourselves up for difficult circumstances later.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that we know what is going to happen with Intercollegiate Athletics and CTE, Basic Skills or Transfer. They are giving us this information and letting us make the tough decisions.

Mr. Fouquet highlighted a memo from Jack Scott regarding additional growth funding, questioning the interpretation.

In response to a concern expressed regarding asking faculty to stuff classes even further, Dr. Kinnamon reported that it was not his intent.

Dr. Kinnamon reported that he does not know how they cannot suspend Proposition 98, but he is hopeful that they don't.

In referencing the "green" allocation sheet that was distributed, Mr. Fouquet noted that if the P1 growth holds up 232 should be added to the District Total FTES Target to equal 15,563. He raised the question of what number to use if the growth doesn't hold up.

Mr. Legaspi suggested that other districts that can will position themselves to capture the growth. Mr. Fouquet reiterated that Chancellor Scott's memo may be saying that you may not be able to get growth above the P1.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that he still has some hope for the best.

Mr. Wagoner expressed that at Chabot College, Fall has to be "put to bed" by Monday, April 4 and should have already been "put to bed." He expressed that what Mr. Fouquet is advocating for - to predict a best case scenario - is dangerous for the Colleges because it will force us in the Spring to "gut" classes and programs.

Mr. Fouquet expressed that the "green" allocation sheet is a middle case scenario if we include the P1 growth.

Dr. Kinnamon expressed that California public institutions, public education and public employees are being attacked and public opinion is against us. He also brought up the issues of the Jarvis group and pension reforms, which brought on a discussion.

Dr. Luster expressed that she does not want to take all the cuts from Spring, and we are close to cancelling several from Summer. She also expressed that she does not want to have a Fall schedule with an inflated FTES or with courses that won't be offered.

Mr. Wagoner expressed that the "green" allocation sheet cuts Chabot more FTES than LPC from a percentage standpoint; and the "blue" allocation sheet cuts LPC significantly more than Chabot. He expressed that he would like to discuss an equitable split in order to get to the bottom number, whatever it is.

Mr. Fouquet suggested that the Committee agree that the cuts should be the same at both campuses from the previous base that was targeted – 10,041 Chabot and 7,551 LPC.

Mr. Wagoner reported that the funded bases are: Chabot 9,961 and LPC 6,946.

Dr. Kinnamon distributed revised allocation sheets, which were discussed.

Dr. Luster noted that LPC's CEMC is scheduled to meet this afternoon and asked for direction from DEMC as to what numbers should be used by CEMC as the target. She questioned if the "green" allocation sheet should be used.

Mr. Wagoner again expressed that the cut need to be equitable between the two colleges, which would change the "green" sheet. He noted that the cut should be 9.33% Chabot and 9.31% LPC on the funded growth to get down to 15,331. He noted that the change is 49 FTES.

Mr. Fouquet reported that this is using the bins from two years ago, and we should be using updated bins. He offered to calculate those numbers. Mr. Fouquet noted that he will take the updated numbers and get the funded growth down 15,331. He also noted that for the record, he recommends taking the P1 into account. It was agreed that the funded base for 2010-11 is 10,041.

Mr. Wagoner reported that the bins benefit because of the increase in productivity rather than the bins benefitting FTES allocation.

Dr. Luster reported that both Colleges are taking dramatic cuts to physical education, to which Mr. Fouquet responded that as PE goes down in percentage, it will drive more FTEF. He suggested that rather than lower the amount in PE, to leave it as it is and let it drive more FTEF on the allocation next year.

*(The meeting was paused to allow Mr. Fouquet to calculate the numbers.)*

Upon Mr. Fouquet's return, a new "green" allocation sheet was distributed and discussed. Mr. Fouquet explained that in his proposal, both Colleges will take a 10.04% cut over the 2010-11 base. The new "green" sheet he proposed reflects a target for Chabot of 9,033 FTES and 542.6 Allocated FTEF; and for LPC of 6,298 FTES and 371.4 Allocated FTEF.

Mr. Fouquet made a motion, seconded by Dr. Ankoviak to adopt the Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2011-12 scenario as proposed by Mr. Fouquet. Further, it is moved that if P1 growth comes through, the FTES would be adjusted upward accordingly.

Motion carried.

**III. Other**

There were no other items discussed.

**IV Next Meeting**

Next Regular Meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 6, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

bb

APPROVED: May 6, 2011