Glossary of terms used in this report

**Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)**
Students in a class at Census multiplied by student contact hours including lab hours -- excluding some grant-funded hours.
(Noncredit WSCH = Summation of all student contact hours in a class for the duration of the class divided by the number of weeks the class meets)

**Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTE)**
FTE is a standard full teaching load. Typically, 15 hours per week multiplied by 17.5 weeks for credit, and 25 hours per week multiplied by 17.5 weeks for noncredit each term. Some faculty, depending on discipline, have a non-typical standard full teaching load.

**Weekly Student Contact Hours per Full Time Equivalent (WSCH/FTE)**
This is a ratio that expresses how much WSCH is produced by the total number of instructional faculty in the department.

**Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES)**
FTES is total semester WSCH divided by 525, where 525 equals the number of hours of instruction received by a student who attends classes 15 hours per week for two terms or 35 weeks. Noncredit FTES equals Total Positive Attendance Hours divided by 525.
Introduction
The budget review conducted during Spring 2006 semester of all academic affairs departments resulted in Report #1 (May 30, 2006) which identified a number of departments and programs for further review and analysis. In June 2006, the Vice Chancellors conducted a review of all academic affairs departments based upon two different versions of the Rough Cut data: the original Rough Cut produced by the Office of Institutional Advancement which included data from 1998/99 through 2004/5 including the summer sessions, and an updated and revised version of the Rough Cut that excluded all summer sessions (included only Fall and Spring semesters) and added data from 2005/6 for credit programs only.

Criteria for Review of Academic Programs
Three major criteria were used to identify departments and programs that warranted further review. These criteria included,
1. Department/program trends with a substantial decline in weekly student contact hours (WSCH) over a 3-5 year period. WSCH can also be expressed in terms of Full Time Equivalent Students or FTES.
2. Department/program trends with a substantial decline in WSCH relative to total faculty (WSCH/FTE) over 3-5 years.
3. A review of external conditions and market forces that contribute to the lack of growth or steady decline in an on-going manner which impact program enrollment.

Results of the Vice Chancellors Review
The Vice Chancellors Review identified three departments that will require further review this Fall. The follow up review will address a variety of options including improving enrollments and retention.

Another seven departments were removed from the original list because there are no significant problematical trends in either enrollment or WSCH/FTE. No follow up activities are needed for these programs.

The Vice Chancellors also identified additional programs where long term trends suggested the need for additional support and direction from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on a continuing basis. No further actions are needed and the Vice Chancellor will make annual reports to the PBC on the progress of these programs/departments.
Next Steps Comprehensive Budget Review: Review and Analysis of Budget Options

The comprehensive Budget Review and Recommendations Process adopted by the Planning and Budgeting Council in February 2006 has a four step process:

1. Budget Goals
2. Fact Finding
3. Review and Analysis of Budget Options
4. Analysis of Choices and Recommendations

The Vice Chancellors Review completes the second step in this process. The next step—Review and Analysis of Budget Options focuses on the programs and services identified in the Fact Finding stage. The options review includes the three departments/programs identified in the Vice Chancellors review (see page six) as well as the programs, services and other units identified as follows:

1. Aircraft Maintenance Technology
2. Journeyman/Training
3. Transitional Studies
5. Cafeteria: Eliminate deficits
6. Campuses: Long term review of campuses for potential consolidation and cost savings
7. Retention programs: Consolidation of services related to retention programs
8. Admissions/Records/Matriculation: Review and realign delivery of services to optimize use of personnel across all delivery operations.
9. GED: Investigate optimal level of fees for GED program.
10. Student Development operations: Implement technology enhancement including document imaging to select student development operations.
11. Administration/Finance: Identify cost savings in specific areas of Administration and Finance.
12. Administration/Finance: Technology enhancements to achieve cost efficiencies in selected areas of Finance and Administration.
13. Administration/Finance: Identify opportunities for consolidation of personnel positions in emerging vacancies in F/A.
15. Institutional Advancement: Cross train advancement staff to deliver multiple services and activities.
16. Chancellor’s Direct Reports: Reduce staffing personnel by 1 FTE; reduce travel and consultant expenses.

Framework for Step 3 Options Review

The options review will be conducted during this Fall semester under the oversight of a special working group comprised of members of the Planning and Budgeting Council and the Program Review Committee.

The goals of this review:
1. To identify feasible reduction options
2. To identify investment opportunities to allocate budgets to improve enrollments and eliminate financial losses associated with the programs and/or services.
3. To assess the implications and consequences related to reductions and/or investment opportunities. Deans and department chairs will be responsible for leading the first level option reviews with their departments, programs and/or services. They will develop a range of options from reductions to investments which will be presented to the appropriate senior administrator for discussion and review.

Each proposed option shall include both long-term and short-term savings and/or costs associated with it. Included in each option proposal:

1. Determination of specific resources (personnel and non-personnel) associated with either the savings or the investment.
2. Rationale for supporting the investment option based upon the College’s Strategic Priorities and Goals.
3. Rationale for supporting investment option based upon labor market and other external factors.
4. Rationale for supporting a reduction option based upon the following criteria:
   a. Does not significantly impact academic instruction and student services
   b. Will not cause major complications for normal, basic operations (programs and services)
   c. Generates on-going savings
   d. Review of external factors does not provide a strong rationale for continuing the program
   e. Is not prevented by legal or statutory requirements
   f. Has low risk of causing significant external adverse effects
   g. Has minimal adverse effect on achieving and fulfilling strategic plan priorities and institutional mission/goals

Once the review at the senior administrative level is completed, the senior administrator will present the options findings to the oversight committee. The committee will review and then report to the Planning and Budgeting Council. Additional resource staff will be assigned to specific programs/services to provide support for the options review where needed.

**Timeline**
- The review will take place during October and November and proposed options will be presented to senior staff by November 15.
- Senior staff will present findings to the oversight committee by December 1.
- The oversight committee will report to the PBC by December 7.

**Step 4: Choices and Recommendations**
The final step of the Budget Review and Recommendation Process is the analysis of each option by the Planning and Budgeting Council and the recommendations for reductions and/or reallocations. The PBC will address this step during December 2006 based upon the options brought forward by the oversight committee. The PBC will make recommendations to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for implementation during the next three fiscal years.
Vice Chancellors’ Review of Academic Programs
Using Rough Cut Data

I. Departments Remaining on List for Options Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Maintenance Tech.</td>
<td>Enrollment trends substantially negative from 1998 to 2005 –78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to college average, WSCH/FTE trends are substantially negative since 1998 (from +18% to --32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman/Training</td>
<td>Enrollment trends substantially negative since 2002 --44% (ncr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to college average, WSCH/FTE trends are substantially negative since 1998 (from --15% to --44% ncr; +75% to --26% cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Studies*</td>
<td>Enrollment trends substantially negative since 2002 –33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to college average, WSCH/FTE trends are substantially negative since 1998 (from --43% to --53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Transitional Studies review will focus on ensuring the alignment of educational services with recent high school reform activities, the introduction of the CAHSEE exit examination and other related developments.
II. Departments Recommended To Be Taken Off List—No Further Action Required

1. Architecture
   FTES (WSCH) increased from 1998 to 2005 and WSCH/FTE has also gained.

2. Astronomy
   While FTES (WSCH) has declined since 1998, the number of FTE has also declined while WSCH/FTE remains stable and 50% above the collegewide average.

3. Asian Studies
   Small department; FTES (WSCH) and WSCH/FTE both increased since 1998.

4. Fire Science
   Fire Academy data distort the overall trend picture for this department. WSCH/FTE remains stable and above the collegewide average.

5. Library Information Technology
   WSCH/FTE has been increasing since 2000 and is now above the collegewide average.

6. Graphic Communications (Non-credit)
   Non-credit program is being phased out and no further action is needed.

7. Health Science (non-credit)
   Non-credit program is being phased out and no further action is needed.
List of Departments for Follow-up Monitoring by Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

(Departments listed below are all robust programs but show evidence of some weakness either in enrollments or in productivity. The Vice Chancellor will work with the departments to address these problems.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apprenticeship</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) increased since 1998, and WSCH/FTE improved from --49% to –32% since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bus/Office Tech/Small</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) decrease of 12% since 2001; WSCH/FTE decreased compared to college average from –10% to –23% since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus (noncredit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Child Development</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) decrease of 36% since 1998; WSCH/FTE improved compared to college average from --5% to 1% since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Credit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Computer Science</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) decrease of 33% since 2003; WSCH/FTE decreased but continues to be positive compared to college average from +54% to +25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culinary Arts</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) decrease of 48% since 2001; WSCH/FTE improved compared to college average from --53% to +7.4% since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-credit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engineering Technology</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) decreased and increased during 1998-2005; WSCH/FTE compared to college average declined from --16% to –30% since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environmental</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) increased since 1998; WSCH/FTE compared to college average decreased from 7.2% to –15% since 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture/Floristry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ESL</td>
<td>Credit FTES (WSCH) declined by 16% since 1998 and noncredit FTES (WSCH) declined by 7.7%. WSCH/FTE compared to college average declined from –18% to –23% in credit since 1998;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Labor and Community</td>
<td>FTES (WSCH) remains steady in credit but declined 80% in noncredit since 1998; WSCH/FTE in both credit and noncredit remains negative compared to college average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Fashion (non-credit) FTES (WSCH) decline since 1998 by 27% and WSCH/FTE gap widening compared to non-credit collegewide average from +7% to –43% since 1998.

11. Photography FTES (WSCH) decline since 2000 by 16% and WSCH/FTE compared to college average has gone from –20% to –13.7% since 1998.

12. Theater Arts FTES (WSCH) has been up and down since 1998 but WSCH/FTE has continued to be negative compared to college average from –28% to –26% since 1998.