

**After reviewing the rubrics, proposal, and rationales developed thus far, please suggest revisions to the proposal along with a concise rationale.**

1. Steep cuts to the natural sciences were proposed: 34 sections in the four disciplines of Oceanography, Geology, Meteorology, and Astronomy. All of these classes fill to capacity when they are offered and the other natural sciences electives are at capacity as well. Any cuts to natural sciences would present a significant challenge to students who need to complete a natural sciences elective or desire to take additional elective credits for their degree because there would not be enough sections to meet demand. I propose that these programs remain intact. If there are additional costs incurred by these classes that are not covered by tuition and fees, consider increasing the class fees or finding other financial resources to meet that need. Clark is the community's first option for affordable higher education. It is important to continue to provide an enriching variety of science courses to expand an individual's knowledge of science.
2. Restore the 15 sections of general Music Classes. By cutting the Humanities Dept. (a good move actually), along with German, French, and other language options, students will need options for the Humanities Distribution. From the Fine Arts only Art and Drama would be available to the general student and this is quite lopsided. Student numbers for the general music courses would return to the full classes of the past. Currently online general music classes are always full.
3. Restore the 15 sections of general music classes. They are predominantly A list classes (music appreciation, music history, jazz appreciation) and are necessary for the students to make the ensemble classes (Band, Choir, Orchestra) count as part of Humanities Distribution. Under the proposal, only Music Theory would be an A list (academic rather than performance) course. More students are interested in music to enrich their lives, but not always do they play an instrument or sing.
4. Medical Radiology: granted our numbers are small but two reasons to retain the program are as follows: To my knowledge M-Rad programs in the metro area are few in number. While the demand for radiology techs may not be projected to rise considerably in the future (I do not know), this metro area needs more than the one or two current programs. As technology changes, additional training and education will be necessary for all of the already existing radiology techs. Even if all of that level of continuing ed were provided at OHSU, or maybe if especially if all of the training is done at OHSU, fewer community resources may be devoted to entry level training due to the demand for continuing training. The second part of this is my understanding that our current program was funded in large part by seed money from Legacy. If they are not in agreement with the decision to eliminate this program, that could seriously jeopardize all of the other current, and future, clinical partnerships with that institution. Nursing: I cannot dispute the reality of a glut of nursing programs around the metro area in addition to the desirability of working in the pacific northwest. We have never suffered a severe shortage of nurses. However, nine years ago the state awarded us additional dollars to expand the nursing program because of the anticipated, nation-wide nursing shortage. That shortage has NOT run its course, in fact the heaviest impact may still be a few years away. I do not know the demographics of the nursing workforce in the metro area, but it's feasible that disproportionate number may be retiring over the next decade, and if that's so, we could, for

the first time, actually experience a true shortage right here. Another related reality is if our enrollment decreases, our need for clinical sites will commensurately decrease. Other nursing programs will immediately claim those vacated clinical sites leaving very little, if anything, to utilize if our program seriously needed to expand again. Perhaps it would be more prudent to decrease nursing enrollments to 40 rather than 32. 40 students can be adequately accommodated in a single class section. A significant savings would still be realized but obviously not as impressive as with cohorts of 32. Expanding and reducing the theory and lab components of a nursing program is relatively easy. Clinical expansion is absolutely not. A smaller nursing program may be justifiable today, but the ability to expand tomorrow may well be impossible. Lastly, when nursing enrollments decrease, what will be the trickle-down affect on the pre-req science and gen ed courses? The instructional savings may likely increase due to declining enrollments in those courses and departments as well.

5. I would be interested in future high demand CTE careers/Bureau of Labor career projections on the horizon that are currently being explored with our community workforce partners that might replace the low enrolled/discontinued programs/classes. What are our priorities in the CTE areas once the budget is stabilized and/or begins to improve? I am very impressed with Tim Cook and the rest of our administrative leadership - the process has been fair from my perspective. I appreciate the rigorous research, the joint governance process and the communication process.
6. what would it save to allow for surveying and geomatics to create a Certificate program? they have low retention rates because students are finding work before degree is complete.
7. Something that would help me would be an increase in the number of columns that you have provided, with data. I know people have asked for the line item values that you all added together to get the estimated "savings" to the college column, but I need a little more information. Classes that are proposed as reduced or eliminated: Let's use French as an example for a class. You mention that the classes are under enrolled. Over a three year average, could you please provide the % enrollment? For example, if all French 100 classes had an average % enrollment of 670/1000 seats, 67%, that would help me understand a bit of what you mean by under enrolled. I am totally ok if you lump together all French "101" (I made that number up and didn't look at the Clark website for speed here...). Same with French "201". You mention that 201 is not well enrolled, again, what does that mean? At what %? Same with all of the classes that you have proposed cutting. Program Closures: For programs I would like to see the same thing. Especially the average number of students who enroll in a program. And if a program starts in fall only, can you please state that (e.g. fall only starting program enrollment is 30/50 students filling at 60%). If it starts every quarter, break it down and so on (e.g. fall starting enrollment is 60%, winter starting enrollment is 40%, spring starting enrollment is 20%). Another column added: Total number of students affected if a program is closed is X number of students. This additional column applies to program closures ONLY is that total number of students who will be affected (a 3 year average is totally fine) if a program is closed. For example, perhaps addition counseling has a 3 year average of incoming students of 120 (I am making this number up!) while surveying has 12. One can hypothesize that these students are not interchangeable at Clark (while language students would be, such that a student unable to take French at Clark would be "forced" into making another choice of a language based on our

offerings. I accept this hypothesis as likely valid). A student coming to Clark for Addiction Counseling would probably not say, gosh, they don't have that so I'll be a surveyor instead! Program closures affect student career choices, which is a different beast - so it would help me if I could see the average number of students that we would lose (average taken over the past 3 years is totally fine). The next column I would like to see added in would be the income loss to the college for program closures (only). I would call this "anticipated revenue loss". Again, these program students MIGHT change their major (totally possible, I concede that) but it would help to see the revenue lost if all of these students simply disappeared. For example, what if the revenue lost if every student in the closed programs decided they weren't coming to Clark (I concede this is not going to be 100%, but just for ease let's assume it is), and the lost annual revenue is "\$600,000" (I made this number up). What this implies is that your 600,000 proposed "surplus" of over-cutting isn't actually a surplus at all, and we have hit our target number needed exactly. Finally - and these two things will be very controversial but I need to know for peace of mind. When classes were targeted were classes that are consistently under enrolled chosen before classes that fill well? If we are indeed simplifying pathways, I can see how sometimes closing 100% enrollment classes makes sense. If we are also trying to be more efficient, we could close under enrolled surplus pathway classes as well, and trim more or the same fat. For example - making this up.... as I have no data to support this, it is simply a comparison. You mention closing 25% of the sections of geology. If those sections of geology are well attended, at 100%, then yes, you close a pathway and force students elsewhere. Are you trying to force them into lower enrolled courses? Why not simply cancel XXX 102 which is low enrolled as the recommended cut instead? This still costs an adjunct their job, but it makes sense from reducing pathways and targeting classes that students aren't inclined to take also - therefore student impact is lower but the end result (someone lost their job and the college saves that income!) is the same. And the most controversial.... if a class is not needed for a degree, and students have other choices to take instead, were classes with low student success rates recommended for closure? If we are truly focusing on students, and being innovative, getting with the times, being relevant, would it not make sense (in an area where students have other choices!) to close down sections of courses where student success is lower and thereby "force" the department/unit/program to revamp the curriculum, work on it, make it relevant, improve it to entice more students to return to the course at a later date when enrollment numbers support its re-emergence into the curriculum which would achieve the same result (pathways are reduced, but not eliminated, courses are reduced/eliminated and as such we have an estimated proposed savings to the college. I wonder if some of these things were considered when the list was made. I understand they are unpleasant, and generally not talked about publicly, but of course are whispered about privately. I have no numbers so I really am speaking/questioning anecdotally.

8. Science cuts seem too extreme: can we cut back offerings rather than completely cut something like Oceanography or Meteorology? Language cuts seem too extreme: Why cut French and German completely? French is studied quite a bit in high schools still. Could we just cut second year? For German, since the professor is on the RIF list for English, are the savings that much? He would need considerable retraining to be able to teach in English (and teach what is needed there). How much would that cost? How long would that take? Cutting other second year offerings makes sense right now. We could add back as needed in the future. Nursing cuts

seems extreme: Does Nursing bring students in? How long would it take to see the savings of the \$400,000 cut? Is that really realistic? Cuts to classes associated with ASCC programs is problematic: How are these programs going to run without corresponding classes? Classes are needed to teach the skills to be able to take part meaningfully in the programs. Cut to Humanities is an excellent decision. This will make HUM offerings more manageable and get rid of the pretty worthless HUM 101 and 102 courses. Cut to Fitness Trainer seems to make sense. If a degree is not needed, why do we have this program? Cut to Math offerings seems to make sense. There are too many exit points in math, and as research shows, the fewer the exit points, the less chance students have of completing. Cut to Physical Education seems to make sense. We don't need as many offerings as we have. In regards to Paralegal, Addiction Counseling, Surveying and Geomatics, and Pharmacy Tech, if the data is in fact correct, these cuts seems to make a lot of sense. Cut to Business Technology and NTEC Microsoft seem to make sense given falling enrollment. If numbers of students in Medical Radiography are that small, it makes sense to cut, but it does seem like this was a pretty high-profile program at one time. Is the investment we put into this program worth cutting it completely? Interesting that journalism was not on this list at all. The load for that department is the lowest in the college, and classes associated with the ASCC program were not targeted at all when others were

9. Do not cut the German program, but scale it back. Since the German instructor can RIF into English, then create a dual load for him, part English, part German. We have done this in the past with a History/English load and a Hum/English load. The Instructor could teach one German course per term and two English composition courses per term, or some other feasible combination given student demand. If the German course does not make for that term, then the Instructor would simply pick up another English composition class per contract.
10. Early College Program Create more pathways for exceptional sophomores in High School to earn both college and high school credits. Because students must take four years of English (Writing and Literature), the normal Running Start sequence of English 101 as Junior and English 103 as Senior, plus two literature classes does not work for the ECP because we have not designated non-English courses as writing-intensive. If other classes in the Humanities, Communications Studies could be designated as "writing classes" then the ECP students could fulfill a their high school requirements with college courses. For example, the Vancouver School district approved Communications Students 220 as a writing class for iTech Prep students, so these students fulfilled their "writing" requirement and there college communication requirement. We could propose through the Running Start office that some Humanities course such as The Art of Being Human and Popular Culture as both writing and literature classes if both courses involved writing about some literature.
11. The proposals to reduce offerings in ASTR, GEOL, METR, and OCEA are not tenable because there is not space available in remaining science classes to accommodate the students from those eliminated sections. This may not have been apparent to Instructional Council during their initial analysis of unused capacity. At first glance, Enrollment Management Data seem to show a fair amount of unused capacity in Natural Science classes. For the following reasons, most of that unused capacity does not represent seats that non-science majors could occupy to help satisfy their natural science distribution requirements: (1) some unused seats were in sub-100 level classes; (2) in classes where students register for lecture and lab separately (but where

lecture and lab are corequisites), an empty seat in lab would be double-counted as an additional empty seat in lecture; (3) in multi-quarter course sequences, many of the empty seats are in the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the sequence (courses that extremely few gen ed students would take due to the prerequisite of completion of earlier classes in the sequence). I have forwarded an analysis of the available space in natural science classes, and the considerable cost, in lost revenues (certainly not budget savings), that cutting ASTR, GEOL, METR, and OCEA would produce, to the [NAME OMITTED] and the STEM Leadership Team. I can provide that file along with further explanation, to anyone else who is interested. I will provide more positive suggestions in a separate submission.

12. I disagree with cutting the number of nursing students from 48 to 32 for several reasons: 1. The nursing department would lose 96 clinical placements. Each of these placements is extremely valuable and very challenging to obtain in the first place. Once we give up these sites, it would be nearly impossible to get these sites back. The faculty in the nursing department has worked really hard to maintain these partnerships with these clinical placements in the community and I think it would be very detrimental to give these placements up. 2. Dedicated and student fees would also be reduced. The equipment and supplies in the lab would all be the same, but there would be less money to help fund everything that is needed to teach these students in the sim lab. 3. Currently every room in the lab is used everyday, all day and if the number of students decreased our lab would not be utilized to its full capacity like it is now. 4. Lastly all of the prerequisite classes would be effected. The nursing program would be accepting 48 less students a year, so that is 48 students that would possibly doing their prerequisite elsewhere. Healthcare is not going anywhere. If anything it is going to continue to grow.
13. What I find most disturbing about this proposal is the fact that it seems to be entirely numbers-driven. As I'm sure has been suggested already by others, there are other compelling factors to be taken into consideration, particularly if our concern is to actually serve our students. For instance, transfer students look to us to offer credits that they will be able to use at their transfer schools - we know this. The BA almost always has a foreign language requirement attached to it, and at most schools that requirement cannot be met by ASL. In my own area of History, my undergraduate degree required four years of a foreign language, my graduate degree required proficiency in two foreign languages. If students cannot begin their foreign language study throughout their first two years, they will be seriously disadvantaged when they transfer. Many of our students have chosen to cross the river and take their language courses at PCC [I don't have the figures on this, but certainly have the anecdotal evidence]. While I realize that these cuts are primarily focused on programs with terminal degrees, and I completely see the rationale of cutting a program that is offered conveniently [which means locally] and affordably at an alternate location, I wonder about the impact this will have on our enrollment over all. For the past ten years I have taught nursing students, welding students, students in the fitness program, etc. Don't program cuts remove those students from my classes as well? I'm also concerned that this proposal was offered with only "bottom line" figures - numbers of students and faculty affected were not included which sends a message that our concerns are focused in one area only. Where I agree with the proposal is that we should not be turning out degrees for which there is no market, but I'm not sure that this outweighs other concerns. Because the market fluctuates so wildly, I don't feel that we should be entirely market-driven,

which seems to be the trend. What is being presented as "endless options" for students unable to make up their minds I suspect has at its core those completion figures on which the State bases the aid that we receive. Many of the courses whose cuts are proposed provide the soft skills that are necessary to deal with marketplace fluctuation - critical thinking, analytical skills, creativity, and others that can be used to respond to the market without returning to school for retraining. I am concerned that in our drive to streamline we risk becoming too narrow in our focus.

14. Reiterate that the Natural Science Reduction Items (Oceanography, Geology, Meteorology and Astronomy) should not be considered AT ALL. Contrary to the stated Rationale, these courses are barriers to degree completion and there ARE NOT a number of other natural science electives available. Students (who it is ALL about) have the most difficult time fulfilling this requirement with the limited options as it already stands. Currently students transfer without completing due to the limited availability, this would contribute to further decreases the completion rate here. Math is also difficult for students to successfully find/schedule; my experience has been that students are not favorable or simply cannot find math classes that fit with their schedule, so it may be a better plan to offer classes that are more student-schedule friendly, not faculty-schedule friendly. It is very telling that there is also no mention of any administrative reductions...it is only faculty and staff that must be reduced?!
15. Elimination of the Addiction Counselor Ed program makes sense. Completions (even I you include AA program) are very low and the jobs require a bachelor's degree or higher. If a bachelor's degree is needed then some of these courses could be incorporated into an AA degree with a social service track for students who intent to transfer. This appears to be true of the NTEC program also, most jobs advertised in this area appear to want a bachelor's degree in computer science. Pharm tech – low job growth, but a certificate will allow for employment. I'm not clear about the AAT and what that adds for a student's career opportunities. Perhaps this is where we should scale back. Completion rates are good due to cohort model. Paralegal, moderate growth and students can get jobs with the certificate or AAS – as long as they have experience also. 10th percentile pay is decent. However, there is little overlap with any other programs at Clark. Nursing – many job openings prefer BSN. Still a steady growth area with a large number of people retiring within 10 years. Given the # of credits and cost it would be better for students if the was a bachelor's level program. This is good wages and good completion rate due to cohort. Medical radiography – low annual openings, even with moderate growth the numbers are small. Didn't we spend a lot of money to get this up and running? CNA – low paying wages. But so is culinary and ECE. We do have completions in this area. If others can better serve this population at less cost to students then it makes sense. Survey – low completions, makes sense to eliminate. Fitness Trainer –Does this eliminate the entire group fitness, yoga, corrective exercise? This is a pretty good # of completions to eliminate. Entry pay not very high. Seems ok to eliminate. DRMA – yes, very small numbers. Can this be incorporated into a special projects? POLS– yes, very small numbers. Can this be incorporated into a special projects? CMST - yes, very small numbers. Can this be incorporated into a special projects? SPAN – JAPN – GERM –FRCH – about the same for second year, none strong but work as cluster of all 3. What languages are strong at transfer schools? OCEA – summer filled 2, spring could have been 1 filled class. Can this just become part of a larger

natural science department that houses multiple options for 100 level science classes for students. Not everyone needs/wants biology or chemistry. GEOL – running full. Needs 200 level courses to attract more students as a science major. METR – running mostly full – can't these be included in a science dept and offer about half of them ASTR – running too many sections each quarter – could cut back and include this course in a science department CJ – intro to CJ (101) consistently filling – good course for part of a AA social science MUSC – are you eliminating the 101/110 beginning piano and guitar classes or all the applied instrument classes? I would eliminate applied music – this is what private lessons are for, and keep beginning music courses. Read – yes as long as some reading skills can still be found in new CAP classes for those who need help. PE – room for scaling back, cuts or maybe clustering of second level. Do you have to run PE classes for athletes – would there be a cost savings if these went away like model UN and such? HUM – bioethics running clustered, selected topics not full, most others are filling – but may be more appropriate departments for these to live in FLPC – battleground – ok BTEC – run a lot of classes with multiple sections not quite at capacity. Do these students really need the high number of credits for many classes (5 for word, 3 for excel – or could some be consolidated into a Microsoft overview that would give them all the need for fewer credits.) MATH – a lot of classes run at about 80%. Since we know these are high drop classes maybe the classes need to all start a few over capacity so they fall to around capacity. Other questions – what is ANTH& 215 – Bioanthropology. Class cap of 9? Is this needed for something? FACPR – cap of 24 but runs about 6-19, could cut back on these. SOC – intro to soc 101 is a cap or 45 but we run multiple sections that total <45 – could cut some soc 101. Consider not running this online. Cap of 25 online vs 45 in person makes more sense to run all in person. Are there other 101 intro courses which could switch to a larger lecture / hybrid format, or lecture / discussion section? PHLE – is phlebotomy worth running? Class cap of 5 in many, and some still running with 2 or 3. But sometimes the same class (e.g. 115L) had a cap of 5 and 10. Maybe caps went up in spring? HDEV – has a large variety of classis / topics. Are these primarily electives? – maybe these should be scaled back and students could fill up classes like sociology.

16. **NURSING PROGRAM** The Nursing Program at Clark College is a highly regarded, very competitive program. I meet with students who are new to Clark, I assist them with their resume so they can get a student job. I always ask them what they are majoring in at Clark College because this needs to be stated on their resume. Many students say that they hope to get into the Nursing program as they've always dreamed of being a nurse. It would be sad to leave out 52 people every year. At this time, I do not believe that there is a nursing shortage, employers often call the Job Developer in Career Services looking for nurses to apply for their positions. (I understand the hospitals prefer 1-2 years of experience). Three of my nieces and my sister graduated from the Nursing Program here at Clark College. What a life changer it has been for them! I also remember a few years back when the nursing cohort numbers were increased, and how this was celebrated as a success for Clark. I really hope we can continue to provide this program to the same extent as always; if not, it will affect so many of our students in a negative way. The students' who dream of being a nurse are the ones who also take the pre-requisites in order to qualify. If some students don't think they have a chance to get into the Nursing program, then we may lose all the revenue they would bring to the college (if they decide to go elsewhere).

17. Dear Committee. As a member of STEM I endorse and completely agree with the findings of [NAME OMITTED] regarding the poor impact of cutting science sections on our instructional budget. In my personal case the meteorology courses that I teach are always full. Presently I teach Meteorology and Physical science and enjoy teaching all courses related to Physics or meteorology. I do not take the proposed cutting of the meteorology course offerings personally as I will likely retire within the next 3 or 4 years anyway and will be happy to teach any course in our department that survive the ax. However, as a member of the geoscience community and a concerned citizen, I think it would be unwise to remove meteorology and oceanography from our course offerings at Clark College. My main concern is that we face many important public issues in the 21st century related to both of these courses, as well as Geology and Astronomy. In particular, making informed choices regarding climate change, water resources, and land management all require a sound understanding of the Earth Sciences as well as the core physical and biological sciences. I could go on and cite many national reports on the importance of Earth science literacy in higher Ed but it would only stir me up more. Best to all of you in the decision making process.
18. The data provided is flawed I feel and does not reflect the MRAD program's success and actually 100% growth since its inception at Clark College is it 10 years ago? Not sure whom came up with 45 openings in next 5 years in medical radiography. I have placed at least that many graduates during the past 5 years when the economy was stalled. Questions on this data would be: 1) what area does this data cover? just Vancouver, WA perhaps and still not accurate for 5 years 2) consider the source of where this came from? I am very sure the Advisory Committee for MRAD made up of very bright local administrators would not agree with this data. I will present this at the 9/29 meeting and feedback further on their input. I can list the key employment of all graduates currently in Vancouver from Clark College MRAD in a spreadsheet with names should you require this to see the statistics just of Clark program. Regarding completion rate yearly of 6, again depends on which 3 years one looks at of a 2 year calendar year program. From the past cohort of 19 graduating Dec'14 and the 3 years then including the prior cohort of 18 whom graduated Dec'12 obviously the # would be different again at 9.25 average. This statistic is flawed due to MRAD being 2 year program not 3. It should be averaged out over 2 years not 3 obviously to be more accurate. Overall employment rate statistic is also flawed at 74% as it relates to only those students reporting back to the survey and is also flawed statistically in a smaller group obviously with standard deviations. I can present that of the Dec'14 graduating group all are employed except 2 students, 1 of whom was impacted negatively by the MRAD Director and delayed in getting her license hence ability to seek employment, the other chose not to apply for work. closer to 90% of graduates Dec'14 are employed currently. I would like to look at a budget for our dept. and be able to comment on cost savings to implement and make the program more viable given it is a small size obviously. The program has been impacted by poor management for the past 3 years and direction not in best interests of growth or students both. The clinical sites would attest to this if asked for input. Hence the growth of clinical sites stalled and was impacted negatively by random non inclusive decisions being made and not collaborative in nature. However, having said that the program has actually doubled in size since inception. We currently have 18 clinical openings (one not being used and has been in the past successfully). We should have 18 students in our program currently, poor initial screening caused 1 to be lost in Jan'15 immediately and student



should not have entered program initially. Our dept. issue is poor management, no attention to income and outgoings regarding budget so not surprising that our budgetary statistics don't measure up. This can be easily corrected with allowing a collaborative faculty approach to solving this misbalance with the new Interim Dean whom is already on top of so many things in such a positive way! We serve an extended area of students, have agreement with LCC for 4 of their students into MRAD and shown successful placement of all their students in Longview and Clark County area. We have shown national excellence in top 5-10 percentile of national exam, never had a failure of registry licensure of any student on 1st attempt in the past. Let's fix the budget not axe the program! What # of students and supporting clinical sites would allow the program to continue? In other words a proactive not reactive approach would serve the students and community the best and allow our graduates to demonstrate their excellence in the incredible care they provide in radiology departments in our area.

19. With our increasingly diverse and global society, I think eliminating the entire French and German departments would do our students a disservice. I think it would be great if they could do the same as is proposed for Spanish and Japanese: have first year only.
20. As a Humanities Instructor I was taken back that the whole department is on the chopping block - especially in light of the fact that we are all part-time employees who don't cost the college a great deal of money. I realize there is more to the equation than simple math (for example my course net Clark over \$37,100 with 2 courses taught with 35 students in each). Clark pays me \$6660 plus some benefits which might add up to \$10,000 total. This give Clark College (without any tuition reimbursement from the state) \$27,100 to support Administrative salaries in addition to the classified staff who help keep the college running. My comments so far only communicate the dollars. Eliminating the Humanities sets the institution back to a place where this academic discipline is not valued. I value teaching this course because it enables me to provide students with the opportunity to use critical thinking skills in an inter disciplinary approach. Students are exposed to several academic fields in their first year. In addition, students going into some of the Career Technical Fields get exposure to more ideas from a broad range of academic perspectives. I do hope someone is able to respond to my comments. I could go on.....but I know you do have tough decisions to make.
21. Recommendation #1 - Take some of the savings and put it into a more secure and healthier funding stream for directors of ASCC program like Play Production, Debate and UN to keep these programs viable and worthwhile. Work with ASCC and use this budget-cutting process as an opportunity to re-structure the funding relationship for ASCC programs and their directors. These programs are an integral part of the fabric of the college. Recommendation #2 - Although the Music department does need to be trimmed, cutting 15 sections is too much. Let the Music dept come back with their own version of a restructured, more efficient department. #3 - Some Humanities classes are more rigorous and more easily transferred than others. Some actually belong in other departments. Cross-list HUM 180 with Biology, HUM 175 with Women's Studies and HUM 150 with Drama. Let the full-time faculty in Bio, Drama and WS departments decide if they want to teach those classes or not. If not, they will disappear. Keep HUM 101 but eliminate HUM 103, 105, 112, 200 and 201. #4 - Related to the above, take CMST classes off the Humanities distribution list. Communication Studies is not a field within the Humanities and never should have been put there in the first place. #5 - In general, be open to individual

departments and units coming back with different versions of how to streamline. Ultimately, however, the deans should have the strongest voice in how cuts are made.

22. [NAME OMITTED] submitted comments regarding STEM feedback on the budget reduction proposal, and it's impacts on our students. I fully support his recommendations, and my comment here is to utilize the feedback form to show that support (since attachments are not allowed via this form). Thank you.
23. From an analysis of the non-majors physical science courses, it appears that a fully enrolled double section (44 students in lecture, 2 labs) nets the college in excess of \$8000. Contrarily, a single section (22 students in lecture, 1 lab) only nets \$800 if filled and may lose money if fewer than 21 students are enrolled. Instead of draconian cuts which will actually cost the college more, perhaps disallowing single sections and requiring at least 30 students in the double section courses (28 students is the break-even point) makes more sense. STEM leaderships analysis also shows that the proposed cuts are not in agreement with the current student enrollments in the non-majors courses, where we have only 60 empty seats versus the 680 seats eliminated by the current proposal. If we do implement the proposal and those 620 students cannot fill their science requirement, we stand to lose not only the revenue from the science classes, but quite possibly the full tuition from these students as they leave for other schools where they can fill the requirements. Narrowing the options is another issue, of course,
24. The data supporting the elimination of the ACED program lists other training providers for WA Chemical Dependency Professionals. This data contains OR programs. Oregon training provider programs DO NOT meet WA criteria for the Department of Health CDP credential. The closest training programs which meet DOH criteria are Lower Columbia College and Tacoma CC. Clark County is the only county in WA which has voted in the Early Adopter Model for the ACA. This means by April 2016 the Regional Health Administrations will begin implementation of the ACA and Medicare expansion will begin, resulting in increased demand for treatment services. This dynamic was not considered in the data set for job openings. This increase is already being anticipated: 1. Columbia River Mental Health has received 100 more state-supported slots for their methadone treatment program. They will need more counselors to meet this demand 2. Daybreak youth services will be expanding residential beds for 16 to 48 for youth- they will need more clinical staff. 3. Lifeline Connections will be expanding services to the rural areas this year- this will require more counselors 4. Helping Professionals Wellness center has purchased another facility increasing capacity 66%; they have 4 Oregon counselors now who have to be trained in WA. 5. Columbia River Mental Health will be expanding youth outpatient services. 6. Harm Reduction Center ( The syringe exchange) is now providing drug treatment as well as harm reduction. 7. Public Health reports an increase of Hepatitis C cases in Clark County, among substance abusers ALL of the treatment providers in the district report a shortage of CDP's for their existing services. My suggestion is to transfer academic advising to the tenured faculty and curtail some course offerings while leaving the program in place to meet emerging community needs.
25. I think we should be careful about cutting courses that feed into existing or possible certificates, such as the PPI, Women's Studies, and Environmental Science certificates, all of which directly relate to our strategic plan and academic plan. I also think it is a mistake to not engage in

restructuring as part of this. Huge savings could be realized through a reorg, especially one that reduces the number of deans and increases the number of faculty leadership roles. I recommend considering some administrative staff reductions that run parallel to or are outside the instructional admin structure as a way of cutting some costs as well. There is still duplication (pathways and tutoring and student success and parallel high touch, low touch services when all should be high touch) and I see no reason for a separate dean of retention. I also don't think we need the position currently filled by [NAME OMITTED] though I'm sure he is a good employee we could use in some capacity.

26. Generally speaking, I find the rationales for each decision to be reasonable. I agree with [NAME OMITTED] that in the instances of World Languages and Natural Sciences, completing every proposed cut could limit student choices in a way that could prove counterproductive in the long term. If students chose not to attend Clark due to a lack of options, we could be reducing ourselves into a deeper hole. I would like to see that taken into account at the final budget cut. From the start, I was concerned with the use of the rubric. It likely benefitted my program, but some items seemed unfairly weighted. It's great that two members of the art department teach in Learning Communities and College 101, and that Art was awarded an 'H' for that, but to see that statistic visually weighted the same as a program's degree relevance seemed to be a design problem that could impact decision making down the line. That said, I feel that the bulk of proposed cuts meet the basics of the academic plan and the core values of the school. All along I have held that program cuts that refocus the school according to a mission (and not simply to meet an annual budget line) could in the long term benefit us all. That will happen when we see savings from these cuts return to programs that were not reduced as an investment in those programs and the services they provide. I know we all hope to see that day soon. Finally, I believe the ultimate decision on these cuts should be left to the deans as representatives of the faculty. I'm concerned that if faculty is brought into the discussion directly, it could lead to an atmosphere of adversity as instructors vie for funds. Thanks for the hard work and difficult decision making. I don't envy the task.
27. Foreign languages are needed for many graduate programs--German, especially--and in reviewing local high school curricula lately, I wonder how we will serve the community by cutting those programs. And with our Mexican population beginning to outnumber Europeans in some states, does cutting Spanish really make sense? Many jobs seek bilingual (Spanish speaking) applicants. I am in favor of cutting Humanities. There has been an ongoing conversation about that for a couple of years. At the community college level, the Humanities are not needed, and the quality of education in those courses seems suspect, judging from those who have worked on their assessments. Advisors see HUM and direct students there instead of into other programs within the Humanities area. Some of the savings seem small. I think not granting everyone sabbatical who applies would be a good idea. A sabbatical cap (3 or 4 per year) would be one idea. Eliminating or reducing faculty IFDF funds is another idea.
28. Eliminating ANY Natural Science sections is a barrier to degree completion--there are not enough online NS options as it is. Eliminating Geology, Meteorology and Astronomy would greatly disadvantage our online students. There would be an excess of \$600K--please rethink these cuts!

29. It was brought to my attention that some of the statistics used to justify parts of this proposal appear to be selectively extracted from sources simply to justify parts of the proposal. Specifically regarding the future demand for nurses, the number projected was limited to the college's specific service area. And then to justify reducing the program, the projected number of RN graduates was not Clark's service area, but the entire Portland metro area. If this is true, or even close to the truth, the administration will never again have any credibility with faculty. One statistic I would ask be re-visited. Back in around 2005, Clark was awarded significant 'high demand' dollars for expanding the nursing program. What were the statistics used to justify that? How have those statistics changed? Is the public to believe that the nursing shortage has now come and gone in a short 10 years? I will draw attention to the recent conclusion by the American Public Health Association regarding the "nursing shortage". The number of new graduates is projected to keep pace with the number of retirements PROVIDED all of the increased enrollments throughout the nation DO NOT decrease their numbers. Bear in mind this only meets the demand of replacing retirements. It does not contribute to the projected increase in total demand due also to expanded roles in the profession, the increasing geriatric demographic, and a projected decrease in physicians. Reflecting on many things over the past couple of weeks I have to ask, why would any college decimate one of their proven flagship programs? Part of the reason this college is even recognized in the community is due to the nursing program. Based on your own statistics, nursing grads are near the top for projected salaries, job placements and program completion. Clark's nursing graduates are consistently recognized as more prepared, thus more desirable, over grads from other programs, even BSN programs. The sheer number of declared nursing majors floats a number of the science courses, not to mention general education courses. When word gets out that it will even be harder to get into Clark's nursing program, students won't simply stay at Clark and switch majors, they will leave and go another school. Shrinking the nursing program will arguably save some significant dollars in the short run. That will predictably extend to shrinking enrollments in the per-requisite courses, which will then further decrease overall enrollment FTEs. I was led to believe the declining FTEs was the problem. So now you're proposing a strategy that will trickle down enrollments perpetually? One last consideration. I'm recalling the nursing program received a significant endowment for the express purpose of facilitating the preparation of new nurses. How pleased will that family be to discover the college no longer shares the same sense of priority? How interested will other potential donors be to endow anything when their wishes may be disregarded in a few years? Be very careful with dismantling something you can't put back together.
30. I realize that this forum is designed to provide feedback on the Instruction budget cuts; however I would like to make a general comment about the process. I am not aware of any campus-wide communication that displays the rubric that was used to make decisions about Student Affairs budget reductions, nor have I seen any forums or feedback opportunities for that area. Although there may be some negative reactions to the program and course eliminations I think staff respect the transparency in the Instruction cuts. I think that same transparency should be apparent in other areas of the college. A recent email from [NAME OMITTED] indicates that there have been budget savings through open positions and mentioned a dean position in Student Affairs. It is widely known that there are several interim positions in Student Affairs, including the dean position, that have been filled for an extended period. How does that result

in budget savings? Additionally, there have been several positions added in Student Affairs over the past couple of years while enrollments continued to decline. What is the justification? It seems only fair that all areas of the college establish a rubric that is widely available to the campus constituency at large.

31. The cuts/reduction to this department far exceed other departments. It's very important to consider that courses offered in this department such as Word, Excel, Access, etc. are necessary for student success in other disciplines and offer students an opportunity to gain a more holistic approach in their education. It is shortsighted to not consider the impact of reducing courses and the relationship to other curriculum college wide. Increasing DL sections should be considered to support students that are working but still want to continue with education and this would help to curb the slide of enrollments in this department. Students do NOT get this content in high school anymore....at least to a level that provides the level of expertise required in entry-level jobs. Many Math courses require Excel....where will students get this skill?
32. The reduction down to 32 students in the fall of 2016 seems very economically unsound. How can this be the best for the college? The loss in revenue across all departments will be significant, including the book store and cafeteria. Has anyone really crunched the numbers? The savings will be small at best. Cutting the nursing program this significantly will say to the community that the Nursing program is dying at Clark college; that cost can not be measured. We still have the same costs to keep a current nursing lab but now with less revenue. The data that was used to support this decision seems very flawed and not current. The Nursing shortage is coming and then you will ask us to ramp it up, but those clinical sites will be lost to us. We serve students who can't afford the private nursing programs. Other Nursing programs are more than happy to take our students and our clinical sites, LLC is having a huge celebration. Dental Hygiene after taking Nursing's fees for their remodel is not facing any cuts? How will they fund their next project if nursing is gutted! I think this decision has been made without complete understanding of how Nursing works. Who represents us...no one apparently.
33. I suggest that no eliminations to the nursing program budget. The nursing occupation is expected to grow between 10-35% in the next 10 years in Clark, Multnomah, Skamania, Clackamas, Washington, and Klickitat counties. These are high-paying jobs and support many families in Clark and surrounding counties. The average RN salary is \$42/hr in the Clark country area, which is among the highest in the western United States. Further, many of the nursing students in the program are single mothers and/or sole providers for their families. The average age of the students are mid-to-late 20's - these students are not straight out of high school. They are driven, responsible, competent, and dedicated to Clark's nursing program and the profession of nursing. Many of them currently also work as certified nursing assistants in local hospitals and nursing homes in our community, on top of attending nursing school at the same time. Because of this, the Clark nursing program and Clark nursing grads have a strong reputation in our community. Cutting the program would hurt Clark's reputation at Legacy Salmon Creek, Peacehealth SWMC and the community as a whole. Lastly, many of the Clark nursing students complete their prerequisites at Clark College. Cutting the nursing program would decrease enrollment at Clark as a whole.