## Scenarios Summary

Notes: $\quad$ Total range of state cuts: $\$ 11 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 25 \mathrm{M}$
Presented below are most likely scenarios (state cuts \$8M, \$14 M or \$17M)

| Fiscal Year: | 10/11 | 11/12 <br> Status Quo | 11/12 <br> Scenario 1 | 11/12 <br> Scenario 2A | $11 / 12$ <br> Scenario 2B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State cut |  |  | \$8M | \$14M | \$17M |
| Assumptions: |  | base reduced due to FTES loss in 10/11, increase in operating expenses | 6\% workload reduction, increase in operating expenses, assuming June tax package is approved, student fee increase offsets state cuts | $10 \%$ workload reduction, assuming June tax package fails, Prop 98 at minimum,student fee increase offsets state cuts, increase in operating expense | $12 \%$ workload reduction, assuming June tax package fails, student fee increase does not offset cuts, Prop 98 at minimum, increase in operating expense |
| Revenue | 181,156,493 | 176,751,387 | 168,727,979 | 162,642,059 | 159,598,593 |
| Expenses | 182,273,451 | 181,884,824 | 179,251,071 | 177,253,315 | 176,254,271 |
| Net: | (1,116,958) | $(5,133,437)$ | (10,523,092) | (14,611,256) | (16,655,678) |


| Major Variables that may increase/decrease projections: | 10/11 | 11/12 <br> Status Quo | 11/12 <br> Scenario 1 | 11/12 <br> Scenario 2A | $11 / 12$ <br> Scenario 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reduction in deficit factor | 1,563,416 | 1,503,900 | 1,424,793 | 1,364,788 | 1,334,781 |
| Non-resident tuition--enrollment uncertainty (\$18M-19M Budget) | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| restoration of FTES lost in 10/11 (net of PT Faculty expenses) |  | 3,376,901 | 3,376,901 | 3,376,901 | 3,376,901 |
| Productivity increase or decrease | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Impact of Enrollment Fee increase on FTES |  | ? | ? | ? | ? |

Projected Available Resources to close deficit in FY 11/12 (est. as of 9/30/10):

Stability Fund:

Colleges/CS Carryover

10,347,031
(half of 10/11
6,388,878 carryover)

Multi-Year projections (Update as of $1 / 24 / 11$ )


## Table 1

## Analysis Of FTES

| 09-10 P-A | Resident Credit | Non Credit | Total Apportionment | Non resident | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Anza | 18,529 | 79 | 18,608 | 2,538 | 21,147 |
| Foothill | 14,162 | 218 | 14,380 | 1,530 | 15,910 |
| Total | 32,692 | 297 | 32,988 | 4,068 | 37,056 |
| variance from workload reduction | 908 | -20 | 888 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1.028 |  |  |



| $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ Projected--Status Quo |  |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Resident Credit | Non Credit | Apportionment | Non resident |  |
| De Anza | 17,301 | 0 | 17,301 | 2,073 |
| Foothill | 13,382 | 109 | 13,491 | 1,519 |
| Total | 30,683 | 109 | 30,792 | 15,010 |

Same FTES as funded in 09/10 (source, draft recalc $1 / 10 / 11$ )

| 11-12 Projected-Scenario 1--6 \% <br> Workload <br> Reduction (based on $\mathbf{\$ 7 . 9 M}$ <br> reduction) | Resident Credit | Non Credit | Total <br> Apportionment | Non resident | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| De Anza | 16,330 | 0 | 16,330 | 2,073 | 18,403 |
| Foothill | 12,631 | 103 | 12,734 | 1,519 | 14,253 |
| Total | 28,961 | 103 | 29,064 | 3,592 | 32,656 |

Workload Reduction estimated at 6\%
total state reduction estim $\$ 8 \mathrm{M}$
0.94

| 11-12 Projected-Scenario 2A--10 \% Workload Reduction (based on $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 M}$ reduction) | Resident Credit | Non Credit | Total Apportionment | Non resident | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Anza | 15,594 | 0 | 15,594 | 2,073 | 17,667 |
| Foothill | 12,061 | 98 | 12,160 | 1,519 | 13,679 |
| Total | 27,655 | 98 | 27,753 | 3,592 | 31,346 |

Workload Reduction estimated at $10 \% \quad$ total state reduction estim $\$ 14 \mathrm{M} \quad 0.90$


