

Remaining questions from 10-30-20 and 11-2-20 open forums:

That sounds like an opportunity to improve, rather than an immediate cut. Are you thinking that a program might be able to make improvements, not from getting more money, but time to assess and change?

- Yes, departments and programs can begin now talking about these issues with the Dean of their division, to determine if there are ways to be more efficient. This is true of all programs, those that aren't earning as much revenue as they cost AND those that are earning more revenue than they cost.

Where does quality of instruction come into the costs here? Some classes will simply cost more to give students the experiences they need to be educated in this program/field?

- Absolutely. That is why the process has several phases and looks at programs and subject areas through multiple lenses. The financial analysis is a starting point, not a single determining factor or criteria.

On a long term scale, if this process 'reduces' sections offered, does that reduce future FTE?

- One goal of the process is to reduce sections – but only if those sections are too small for the college to sustain. If there is great demand for a subject or program, we would probably increase sections, thereby creating more tuition revenue and student FTE.

Are any other areas besides programs being looked at to lean?

- All other areas outside of programs and subject areas are being looked at for ways to address our budget concerns. For instance, there are numerous open positions across all areas of the college that have not been filled, following last year's voluntary separation program.

Are you coordinating this with the other local community colleges so there is some synergy.

- One criteria we will apply in the next phase of the process is how many Oregon community colleges have programs or subject areas similar to those under consideration.

If there are any programs that showed in the green that we feel should be considered in this reduction process, can we propose that be done?

- We decided on this process and criteria last fall. In this instance, we should let the process play out going forward as designed. As much as possible, I want to avoid directing any negative energy at each other.

Given that this analysis is just focusing on the cost of instruction, how do you anticipate this information will be considered in the POR process for FTE?

- It isn't intended to be a tool for the Faculty Forum process at this point. It could play into whether a department decides to apply for FTE. I will refer this question to the Faculty POR / Faculty Forum subcommittee of the Budget Advisory Group, to get their input.

I think it would be beneficial to us all if we could see all of the cost-saving efforts that are being made. We need transparency as far as how much indirect costs are being examined, versus this emphasis on the direct instructional operations of the College.

- We do have a process, involving the Budget Advisory Group, which has representatives from all employee groups, Associated Student Government, and the Diversity, Inclusion and Equity Committee. The Budget Advisory Group consults on developing our budget and working through cost savings not involving academic programs and subject areas. I know that we are committed to being transparent, to providing multiple means of communication and feedback, and to using the budget development web site to share updates.

As we discuss the development of a methodology that will continue to evolve and then be used to make this a continuous improvement process, would it be possible to write down that methodology development process so that we can make it more efficient over time?

- Yes, we are documenting!

Inductive vs. deductive reasoning.

- We are working in both directions. We are starting with overarching criteria, but as we look at data and hearing feedback, we are modifying criteria and the process.

If we also have a mandate to have a certain number of faculty positions, which is higher than where we are, then it seems like these tools are measuring the wrong things. We will need to have more faculty in fewer programs to achieve both goals. Or look at other costs...

- There isn't currently a "mandate" to have a certain number of faculty positions, although the Executive Team has had discussions with FTF about what an optimal number of full-time faculty would be for our size college. The ultimate goal is not to have fewer FT or PT faculty, but to ensure that the programs we have are needed by our community, consonant with our mission, and ones that we can afford over the long run.

We certainly don't want to eliminate a program based on cost structure, and then discover that program is critical to WHO we are as an institution...?

- Absolutely – which is why we have multiple phases and criteria, and why we want to have substantive and inclusive conversations before any reductions.