



Colleagues--

As faculty leadership prepares for conversations about the summer class schedule, we thought it would be helpful to provide some information about faculty costs, enrollment, and apportionment for summer session. **We think that the following general calculations suggest that premature cancellation of *any* summer classes makes very little sense.** *We are providing this information to support the chairs and Senate in aggressively advocating to preserve the entire summer schedule.*

The average cost of instruction and faculty services during the summer is significantly lower than the average cost of instruction during the regular academic year. As a former chair said to us in an email Thursday evening, chairs have generally understood that **a robust summer program is something of a cash cow**. This is because during the summer, every faculty member teaches on an hourly basis and is therefore paid according to the hourly salary schedules. During the regular academic year, the College's approximately 300 contract faculty members are paid according to the contract faculty salary schedule, which increases the average cost of instruction and allied services.

Here's a rough idea of the relationship between faculty cost and funding to the College. Most of the money that the College receives from the State is earned by FTES, or Full-Time Equivalent Students. For every 30 hours that a student is enrolled in a class, the District receives \$5151 in apportionment. Every ten students in a three-unit lecture class, then, earns the District \$5151 in apportionment. Twenty students in that class will bring in \$10,302; thirty students will bring in \$15,453.

If, for the sake of example, the faculty member teaching that 3-unit class is at Column C, Step 5 on the salary schedule, the cost of instruction for that class is approximately \$5989.73. There are additional, ancillary faculty costs (STRS deduction, taxes, etc.); and there are additional instructional and infrastructure costs of offering each class (aides in the labs, electricity, etc.). But the faculty cost accounts for most of the District's expense of offering a summer class and provides a helpful way of thinking about the decision to maintain or cut the summer schedule.

It's clear that **the cost of faculty instruction is worth the investment**, as the earned apportionment in a class of 20 or 30 students more than covers the basic cost of instruction. Twenty students nets approximately \$4000, and 30 students nets approximately \$9463.27. (As noted, some of that net must go toward payroll deductions and keeping the lights on.)

Another—and the most important—reason that the cost of faculty instruction this summer is worth the investment is that, even if the District just breaks even, we have served thousands of students who need our courses.

To provide a sense of what the calculation of instructional costs and apportionment looks like on a departmental level, here are some figures for the Math Department, where classes are mostly full each summer:

For Summer 2018, assuming:

- the same instructors from summer 2017

- using the 2017-18 salary schedule
- including both the Santa Rosa and Petaluma campuses
- excluding Math 155 (as this was the one course the District did not cancel)
- 32 students in each class at census
- \$5,151 apportionment per FTES for a credit class

Estimated total math sections cut under the District's proposal: **25 sections**

Estimated total number of students without a math class: **800 students**

Estimated total faculty cost of teaching the 25 sections: **\$205,751**

Estimated total revenue (apportionment) of teaching 25 sections: **\$538,451**

Estimated total **profit NOT realized if 25 sections of math classes are cancelled: \$332,700.** (Again, we recognize that there are additional payroll and utility costs that would decrease this figure.)

This pattern of investment in the summer schedule yielding revenue for the District is reinforced by figures from Summer 2017. Last summer, the cost of the faculty was \$4.6 million (this figure includes payroll deductions); revenue from apportionment was \$10.7 million; and the **surplus was \$6.1 million.** Let's say that \$1 million, or even \$2 million, of that \$6.1 was spent on lab assistants, aides, and utilities. We see that Summer 2017 earned money for the District.

We are all clear that the decision to cut, or even trim, the summer schedule is very bad from a student perspective. AFA thinks it's bad from a numbers perspective, too. And given that the summer schedule provides an opportunity for the District to make money, thus helping to relieve the strains on the budget, **we have questions about the District's motivation in the cancellations announced Thursday afternoon.** We can't help but wonder whether the District's strategy is to maintain and deepen its budgetary problems, thus creating the conditions that support its claim that it can't afford Rank 10. Despite our repeated questions to the District about its budgetary claims and our request for a transparent explanation of how cancellation of so many summer classes would save the District \$2 million, the lack of response leaves us speculating. We look forward to the District's transparent response to our questions.

## All Faculty Association

Santa Rosa Junior College

437 Elliott Avenue

[afa@santarosa.edu](mailto:afa@santarosa.edu)

<http://www.afa-srjc.org/>

(707) 527-4731

(707) 524-1762 Fax

-- AFA is working for you. The strength of faculty working together.