Grossmont College
Enrollment Strategies Committee
Meeting Summary

March 2, 2011
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Griffin Gate

Present:  Fred Allen, Steve Baker, Barbara Blanchard (Chair), Janet Castaños, John Colson, Chris Hill, Oralee Holder, Brian Keliher, Mary Rider, Marsha Raybourn, Malia Serrano, Wendy Stewart, Susan Working

Absent:  Rick Griffin

Guest:  Shirley Pereira

Recorder:  Linda Daley

The meeting commenced at 2:35 p.m. In addition to the committee members, there were over twenty faculty members in attendance. Handouts were distributed to the committee members and most of the faculty.

I.  Current directions for Fall 2011

    a.  Budget for 2011-2012 (Handout #1)

        Barbara provided a copy of the FTES Analysis based on Budget Scenarios that Tim Flood presented at the last Planning & Budget Council meeting. The document discussed different scenarios for workload reductions. Barbara explained that although Scenario B states “no growth” it would actually result in a reduction of 5% of our current offerings.

    b.  Scenarios from state

        The scenarios from the state were included in Handout #1, and included a reduction of 17%.

    c.  Generic LED (FTEF) reductions

        Barbara explained that she and Marsha distributed a letter to the chairs asking them to make a plan for 5%, 10% and 15% reductions this fall.
d. Sabbaticals

Barbara said that the board approved seven sabbaticals for the 2011/2012 school year, and they will be cost neutral to the college. Barbara suggested that the LED be taken off of the top for the divisions with faculty on sabbatical.

e. Balance of schedule summer/fall/spring (Handout #2)

The second handout provided a look at the FTES-FTEF balance for summer 2010, fall 2010 and spring 2011. Barbara reminded the group that there could still be some adjustments to the numbers reported for spring, 2011. Barbara said her goal for FTEF percentage of total would be 5% in the summer and 47.5% for spring and fall.

II. 50% Law (Handout #3)

A handout regarding the 50% Law Calculation was presented. Barbara pointed out that as a district our expense of education was 54.88% during the 2009-2010 fiscal year. In terms of dollars, the district exceeded the requirement by $4,201,619.

III. First level of reductions (Handout #4)

Barbara shared that during recent meetings with the deans; she asked that sections cuts be made in ways that would have the least amount of impact for our students. She suggested that one way might be to cut classes that are offered in multiple sections and have a fill rate of less than 75%. There was a discussion as to whether this was the best way to make cuts, and if each division followed the same method of targeting classes. Chris clarified that it was strictly a way of seeing what reduction of LED we would see using that method. The group felt that it would be best for Marsha to distribute multiple copies of the line sheets so that different scenarios for reductions of 5%, 10% and 15% could be completed.

IV. Level two reductions

Barbara provided the group with a three page memo from Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs from the State Chancellor’s Office (Handout #5). She pointed out that the memo discourages the offering of recreational, avocational and personal development courses. She also distributed a memo that was distributed to the instructional deans that discusses and provides direction regarding stand alone classes (Handout #6). In addition, she provided a memo from Scott Lay that addressed some of the recent recommendations from the Legislative Analyst’s Office along with a chart from the LAO (Handout #7). The recommendations included imposing 90 unit caps on students, increasing fees from $26 to $66 per unit, and eliminating the state subsidy for intercollegiate athletics.
V. Additional reductions

a. Reductions by department (Handout #8)

Shirley provided a report that provided a comparison of the average FTES for each department over a three year period ending with spring, 2010. The group indicated that they would like to see the numbers included for 2010/2011 as well as the previous years to extend the report to a period of six years. The group also asked that the report be revised to add “LED” in parenthesis after “FTEF” in order to provide clarification, since we use both terms interchangeably.

b. Strategic reductions by program area

Barbara reminded the group that at the previous meeting she asked members to spend some time discussing with their constituents what type cutbacks we should be making.

c. Discussions on feedback received by committee members from constituencies

Chris said that the conversation at their division council meeting concluded that consideration should be given to areas that typically have not been cut in the past.

Malia said giving consideration to the priorities of what we are offering, instead of just doing across the board percentages.

Oralee said the English department is trying very hard not to cut basic skills and transfer level courses, with the exception of some of the online offerings. She added that literature and creative writing classes that are stand alone courses are being scheduled on a rotation basis as much as possible.

Wendy Stewart said the counseling department will meet in April to work on finding costs savings strategies. They will also look at registration priorities, PDC courses, and potential cuts in counseling services.

Fred shared that many of the programs in his area are controlled by outside accreditation requirements, such as class sizes and field work. He stated that reducing the classes offered would also result in cut backs to the clinical locations, which would be very difficult to restore once the economic situation improves.

Brian asked if the programs that can’t be subject to cuts could be identified and set aside, then 5% or 10% cuts be made to the remaining courses. Barbara said we may also need to consider cutting complete programs. Chris asked what information is needed in order to prioritize and create criteria for section reductions. Malia suggested that there needs to be ground rules for criteria, and that one of the rules should be that the final decisions rest with the departments. Barbara shared that she has been looking at prioritized guidelines from other
colleges. Some colleges have department chairs prioritize every class within their department. Malia asked for a comparison of the departments that shows the percentages of their cuts. Mary suggested knowing the number of students assessed who are in classes above their abilities could be helpful. Barbara said that Jerry is still working on a report that provides the number of students with more than 100 units and the percentage of activity repeats. Steve added that students who have one semester remaining to achieve their goals should have priority registration. In closing this topic, Barbara said that she and Shirley would work together to provide data and information to share to help develop the criteria for priorities.

VI. Other considerations

a. Management and planning for LCE bonus and TA’s

Barbara assured the group that the college is not trying to do away with LCE bonuses or TA hours. She shared that we are trying to make a better plan to manage for them.

VII. Success and transfer rates of students who take > 18 units

Topic not discussed.

VIII. Criteria for Prioritizing Course Offerings

Topic not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.