Thanks for the information on the enrollment management issues. I appreciate the attempt to move things along and obviously finding a criteria and decision-making forum that accommodates everyone is very challenging so I appreciate this important step. This said, I have some questions/concerns that have come up a I have just had a chance to take a look at Beth's email and Randy's survey and am sharing them here given we are being asked to vote in lieu of an opportunity to discuss the proposal in person.

Unfortunately, an up or down vote via survey monkey precludes the opportunity for conversation and dialog about important issues relevant, in this case, to scheduling and the proposed committee. In politics, this is usually part of the intention of an up or down vote though of course may not be here. Nonetheless, given the message was that people need not show up in person, I am wondering if we can get more information and/or further clarification on a few things:

1) I would like to hear more about why the committee needs to be appointed as opposed to voted upon (e.g. maybe by division or some other way). Also, why three year terms? The faculty representation in some ways appears to be structured as a long arm of the academic senate and the rotation seems fairly restricted (three years is a long time) if the goal is to get more not less faculty input. It would be good to hear more about the rationale for these decisions.

2) I am also wondering what is meant by, "Expertise based, global perspective and cooperative orientation will be the basis for member selection" From a public administrative perspective, this could easily be interpreted as prioritizing perspectives that conform to already established management views, and perhaps this is the point? Is part of the goal to lessen the work load of managers (i.e. Deans) as they are now no longer there but currently a part of the process? Would be good to hear more on this as well. My own view is that diversity of perspectives, departments, etc. helps make decision making more robust but there is also the question of making sure that as many faculty as possible get access to scheduling decision-making criteria if the concern, as it is expressed, is one related to fairness and equity.

3) Since the part time faculty don't have a role in the typology of faculty representation and management are already at the table, is a goal to get more full time faculty involved? If so, limiting the faculty that are able to look at the bigger picture (i.e. 2 faculty from each division outside the Senate) might be less effective than expected in creating more transparency for faculty, and certainly department chairs, involved in making scheduling decisions---- probably important if the goal is to get more efficiency/effectiveness out of class scheduling.

4) I believe there was some talk about getting a 21st century enrollment management system going as they have in many colleges/universities to deal with room availability, scheduling conflicts, data input and analysis etc. I seem to recall this was part of broader set of issues for which consultants were brought in a couple of years back (i.e. when I first came to the college in 2015). Clearly we are in a financial situation that may not allow us to move forward in that direction at this time but creating another level of decision makers with specific/privileged information (thus creating more information asymmetries) might not make as much sense as having a "all chairs scheduling meeting" at the outset of a very big calendar change and in the absence of an software based/online scheduling system.