

Get rid of affiliate status as a protected class of faculty.

Affiliate faculty status is the result of labor negotiations and any change would have to come through the negotiation process. Faculty contract negotiations are ongoing, but cannot be included in budget considerations.

Why not cut expensive-to-run Professional Technical programs?

The college has cut three Professional Technical programs in the past five years and the resulting FTE loss is certainly contributing to the college's enrollment issues. The administration of the college has tried to stay away from deep cuts in transfer and developmental/basic education, but the pending \$3.1 million reduction for 2011-2012 makes this impossible to do. From data provided by the state, we anticipate another reduction of \$2.1 to \$3.1 million dollars in fiscal year 2012-2013. Everything is going to be impacted.

For the upcoming year, decisions about which specific programs are cut are based on a variety of criteria, which were selected to maintain student access and diversity, sustain our FTE targets and maximize economic efficiencies. A financial audit of programs is ongoing; enrollment impacts are very complex to measure but we are diligently working on formulating a comparative analysis of redundant programs in our major catchment areas. As a result of that analysis, we anticipate the college will have to decide on additional reductions in professional-technical programs as early as April 30, 2011, in order to contain costs of teach-outs.

Why cut ESL if the college is moving toward a virtual college and more international students, where more ESL would be needed?

Tuition is a primary revenue source for the college. Although the ESL/ABE/GED program brings in approximately \$350,000+ in grants, student achievement money and in enhanced allocations, our basic skills programs, including ESL, do not bring in the tuition revenue that other programs bring in; the majority of these students are not international students and pay only \$25 in tuition (70% basic skills ESL, 30% academic/IP ESL). The business plan for our International Programs identifies a goal of 1,000 IP students by 2015. The FTE and tuition from these students would provide additional support in our IP (advisors, marketing, recruitment, immigration services, etc.), but they would also provide additional revenue to support our ESL academic (international) and ESL adult basic education tracks. Until we actually grow our international student population, the reductions will have to take place in order to ameliorate further cuts in our transfer and professional technical programs. Our goal remains to serve as many students as possible under within the current legal and contractual environment.

Rationale/criterion that cuts should come from departments with more than four full-time faculty disregards the work load of faculty in these departments.

Why cut programs across the board, including those with healthy enrollments vs. targeting specific programs?

The workload in all areas of instruction is impacted by these reductions, no debate. We did not find areas of instruction where reductions in faculty, staff or administration would not negatively impact the workload of those remaining. Workloads vary, at least in the kinds and types of work, depending on program and student needs. When assessing programs that have healthy enrollments, we did not find an unambiguous measure that objectively allows us to rank work loads of faculty in order to more selectively determine which departments would be noticed for RIF. Some of the input we received, however, helped us understand more about the impacts in given academic areas of the college; where possible, adjustments were made to the February preliminary recommendations to address them.

It is important to look at the instruction criteria in the context of the general principles and assumptions, as well as the other listed criteria. The college still must meet its mission and enrollment targets, and must maintain as much diversity and quality as possible. We reasoned that there needed to be a critical mass of full time faculty in each department to adequately support part time faculty and the students.

One assumption not listed, but a fact, is that the contracts for our faculty and staff remain essentially unchanged while negotiations continue. The RIF units with four or more full-time units all have very healthy enrollments. What few under-enrolled programs remain are listed. Programs with an adequate part-time faculty pool, as well as specific programs/disciplines, are also listed.

Show the relationship and impacts on costs and student FTEs of cutting all part-time faculty before cutting full time faculty.

The salary and benefits cost of classroom instruction for a full-time faculty teaching 45 credits/academic year is \$1,733/credit. The salary and benefits cost of classroom instruction for a part-time faculty teaching 45 credits/academic year is \$1,100/credit. The difference in cost is \$633/credit. Our current state funded enrollment target is 5,282 FTE. One full-time equivalent student is defined by 45 credits. The college's total credit allocation is 237,690 credits. If those credits were taught only by full-time faculty as defined above, there would be a 37% differential in cost/credit between all full-time versus all part-time faculty teaching those credits. This example is based on the cost of a full-time faculty with salary/benefits of \$78,000 versus that of part-time faculty at \$49,503 each teaching 45 credits over one year.

As with colleges across the nation, the state community college funding model is built on the concept of a core of full-time faculty to provide stability to degrees and curriculum while the majority of the teaching is provided by part-time faculty. Part-time faculty also bring in current thinking and practice from our business, industry and non-profit partners, flexibility in providing schedules and additional

access to meet student demand, new approaches and technological expertise for learning and social/cultural diversity to our faculty mix. Our full-time faculty develop and maintain our curriculum, assessments and degrees, provide mentoring and advising to both our students and our newer part-time faculty, provide support and assistance in the administration of the college and are involved in many of our student's co-curricular activities. We continue to try to address this balance and meet our mission under severe financial conditions.

Why the difference between the preliminary recommendations and the cuts announced, but not acted on, in December?

There has been much confusion – understandably so – on this issue. The most important thing to understand in this context is that the December cuts and the preliminary reductions reported in February are NOT synonymous; each set of proposed reductions was created in response to very different economic circumstances, and for the purpose of meeting very different objectives.

As November 2010 revenue projections revealed a rapidly worsening financial reality, it became evident that an additional cut in the current year was virtually inevitable; only the source of that cut was in question. The information coming from the SBCTC and WACTC meetings indicated that the legislature would act quickly, and that all colleges would be required to execute specific reductions in the current year. SET began working immediately to identify possible reductions.

On December 3, 2010 the State Board issued a summary of the Governor's proposal that would result in an additional reduction to SCC of \$633,016. With 50% of the year elapsed, each \$1 identified for reduction would yield only 50 cents if taken immediately, and thus the college would have had to identify at least \$1.26 million in "expense lines" in order to accomplish the additional reduction. Additionally, because the college's faculty and classified staff contracts oblige the administration to adhere to prescribed notice periods and specific process requirements before reductions in either of those areas can be implemented, the potential savings from faculty and/or classified reductions that would have been available in the current year were reduced even further. Given these limitations, the personnel identified for reduction represented a "mix" that would permit the college to achieve the required reduction in the most efficient manner, though not necessarily the most sensible one.

Although the State Board did not require colleges to execute the aforementioned reductions, in keeping with its commitment to transparency the administration opted to provide notice to individuals in December, in full anticipation that the reduction would be implemented as soon as January 1st. As we now know, this did not materialize as expected, and the proposed cuts were withdrawn. The legislature continued working on the supplemental budget well after the January session commenced, and only within the past few weeks did it require SCC to transfer funds to 'cover' shortfalls in the current year (i.e., make a supplemental cut); the amount transferred in early March was approximately \$460,000, and came in the form of reduced State Need Grant funding. As of today, March 31, the legislature has still not approved a supplemental budget so the amount the college transferred may not be enough.

The reductions announced in February pertain to the *next* fiscal year, not the current year. Thus, as with previous budget reduction processes, the college has ample time to conduct research, obtain feedback, make final decisions, and provide notice that sufficiently meets contractual obligations and maximizes potential dollar savings. Most importantly, the college is not under severe pressure to make drastic cuts

in a matter of weeks, as was the case this past December. With additional planning time, the yield of reductions tends to even out, and the resultant “mix” of personnel identified for reduction would be expected to be quite different than was the case in December.