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Recollections: Tom Nomof

The focus of this meeting was analysis of minimum and maximum class size.

1. We began by approving the Table Talk for the 11-16-12 meeting.
2. Next, both teams reviewed the following documents brought to the table as homework: an Instructional Cost Analysis Report (ICAR), the YCCD Budget (2012-2013 Final Budget and 2013-2014 Projected Budget), and an analysis projecting required minimum number of FTES to cover operational costs at MJC.
3. Much discussion ensued regarding the data in the above three documents. General analysis based on the YCCD Budget showed that in order to cover each individual faculty member’s total compensation (salary + benefits cost), each faculty member needs to teach 267 students per year. The ICAR is a datatel report that shows the net instructional revenue to YCCD per course using the following formula: 
   \[ \text{Net Revenue to District} = \text{Apportionment Received for FTES} - \text{Instructor Cost for Course Based on Salary} \]
   The report allows one to see the net financial gain or loss for each course offered in YCCD.
4. We then had a full discussion of whether or not this data should be made public to the college community, of the need for general education of productivity, course cost, and a transparent Enrollment Management Committee. In the end, we all agreed that at the table we could only address the contractual issues surrounding FTES and Productivity, and so narrowed our focus down to an analysis of how our cohort districts defined minimum and maximum class size.
5. We then divided ourselves into small groups in order to analyze class size language in the fifteen contracts\(^1\) in our Workload Binders. Next, each group reported out findings and we created a large chart to show how each district defined Max. Class size, Min. Class size, and Large Lecture Class sizes. Minimum Class size on average was defined as 20 students, but most also listed a number of exceptions to that rule. Maximum class sizes were often listed in a lengthy “Master Class Size List” not found in the contract, but many contracts noted that maximum class size was often determined by classroom size and safety codes. Concerning Large Lecture formulas, a 1.2-1.5% class size ranged from 60-76 students and a 2.0% ranged from 85-120 students.
6. All this data led to much discussion and many questions:

---

\(^1\)Workload Binder districts are Chabot-Las Positas, Contra Costa, Grossmont-Cuyamaca, Kern, Long Beach, Palomar, SJ Delta, San Jose-Evergreen, State Center, Sierra, West Valley-Mission, Merced, Foothill-De Anza, Santa Rosa, Santa Monica.
• If YCCD adopts a minimum class size of 20 students, how can we meet the average of 267 students taught by each faculty member to cover his/her cost of total compensation (salary + benefits)?
• How do we educate the YCCD community on the symbiotic relationship between large lecture class sizes and our needed smaller class sizes—that is, class sizes mandated by state and/or safety regulations?
• How do we figure Columbia College into discussion of class size?
• Should we expect a minimum number of FTES to be generated in base faculty load before assigning overload?
• Should we address load balancing in the contract?
• How can we set minimum class sizes when we know there will be many exceptions needed to whatever we set as class minimum?

7. Next, we listed all the exceptions to minimum class size we found in our research contracts, and here they are:
   a. Classes required for graduation, major, career (and infrequently offered), or to meet a specific demographic
   b. Classes offered in limited classroom or lab facility
   c. Classes subject to statutory regulation requiring mandatory maximum
   d. Pilot or experimental class in first or second offering
   e. Contract with outside agency (ie. contract ed.)
   f. Classes needed for load balancing and/or load guarantee
   g. Stacked classes
   h. Classes requiring unique teaching methodology
   i. Historic enrollment (past practice)
   j. VPI finds special circumstances that warrant exception
   k. Off-site (satellite) classes

8. We ended the meeting by agreeing on items for our December 7th meeting—for instance, we agreed to look at online class sizes at MJC and Columbia College and to analyze how they compare to face-to-face class sizes. We agreed to attempt a “Straw Design” for minimum and maximum class size (with exceptions). We agreed to discuss how to connect productivity gains to salary increases. And we also agreed to begin looking at lecture v. laboratory load differences in our Workload Binder contracts.

9. The meeting ended at 12:00pm.
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