# LAS POSI TAS COLLEGE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMI TTEE Minutes of October 5, 2012 

Attending: Dr. Ely (voting); Dr. Flores; Ms. Hart (voting); Ms. Lee (voting); Dr. Noble (voting); Dr. Orf (chair, voting); Dr. Rodriguez (voting); Ms. S. Rodriguez; Dr. Ruys; Mr. Samra; Ms. Scott; Ms. Thompson; Dr. Walthers.

Absent: Dr. Ankoviak (voting), Ms. Miller (voting)

1. Call to order: 3:02 p.m. by Chair, Dr. Orf; District Conference Room 1
2. Approval of Minutes (Sept. 7 and 14): MSC - Hart/Lee unanimous

## 3. Report from DEMC:

Dr. Orf stated that they are starting up the process to figure out the allocation of FTEF for this coming year. Dave Fouquet brought up the concept of the BINS again. They will take the very low productivity courses right off the top; everything else gets allocated right after that. But we don't know how this will affect us. Most of the programs here at LPC show high productivity. Mr. Fouquet will present a couple of models at the next meeting. DEMC will meet again on November 2 (before the election) but we will be making decisions based on the idea that everything is going to go through.

## 4. Discipline Plans

Dr. Noble stated that right now we have already made plans on what to do if it (prop 30) fails; but on November 2 we will decide what we will do if it passes. Dr. Ely suggested two ways to approach the issue: As a minimum remind the faculty that the potential exists that if prop 30 passes we will need a version of the discipline plan that will actually put stuff back in. But remind them that they actually need to be looking at two different versions of discipline plans (prop 30 fails/prop 30 succeeds). To keep it from being a "free-for-all" we might have to set some boundaries.

## 5. Future criteria for cutting or adding classes to schedule

Dr. Orf stated that we need to set criteria for adding/subtracting classes. What we've done in the past is hand it over to the deans, and told them the FTEF that needed to be cut. We asked them to talk to faculty for recommendations. Now we need criteria set like a flow
chart (if it meets this, the class is kept; if it doesn't it is cut). Then we don't have to say we went top heavy on any discipline. Do we as a committee what to come up with this algorithm, or do we want to create a sub-committee to do so? Dr. Flores shared how she discussed cuts with her faculty. She gave them a list of the courses they offered in the last three years and asked them to think about how they see each of their courses as they relate to the college's mission. So for example they are breaking up their courses into one level below basic skills, two levels below, and college level, and then looking at all other courses and how they fall into IGETC and the associate degree. Then they weigh them. They will call in a counselor to double check their findings. This info will be used to determine where to cut and where they might grow. This is just one approach. Ms. Hart stated that we need to be careful with the absolutes as some courses don't hit all the points. History for example, meets all the criteria so it looks like it will never be cut. So it is a concern when we say "never" because when we deal with absolutes then our colleges can end up with simply Math, English, and History (for example). In whatever algorithm we come up with, it has to look at a balance. Dr. Walthers suggested also looking at waitlists. (Discussion)

A sub-committee of four (two from Senate; 2 from CEMC) was created to come up with this algorithm. Volunteers were John Ruys, Sarah Thompson, Christina Lee, and Marilyn Flores. The sub-committee will report back by the October 26 meeting. The committee will take a week to look over their report and then meet again on November 2.

## 6. Good of the order: N/A

Adjournment: 3:50 p.m.
Next Meeting: Friday, October 26 at 3 p.m. in District Conference Room 1

