

*Unit Planning for Student Services
Counseling/Testing*

For 2007-2008 Implementation

Section III: Planning for fiscal sustainability: (Discussion begins on September 21st)

This section should be developed by faculty and staff in the units working with their manager. The work on this section will start during fall in-service and must be submitted by November 15, 2006. The manager of the unit must adhere to the deadline and submit a proposal from the unit by the deadline. Please summarize your ideas in the tables below; additional narrative may be added outside the table, if necessary. Guaranteed proposals and identified Budget Reductions for 2007-2008 should also be listed in the Excel spreadsheet (FY08 Budget Proposals template.xls) with detailed budget information that will be submitted to the budget development process and will focus on Fund 111100.

Preamble: Planning parameters included at the Institutional level

Example:

- **\$6 million recurring deficit for FY 08**
- **Recovery of deficit will occur in the general Fund 111100**
- **2% FTE growth over 2005-2006**
- *********

Division Planning Parameters:

2007-2008 (FY 08) Incremental changes:

1. **Revenue Enhancements:** (Include impact, consequences, and comments; examples might include: receiving grant funding, securing a donation from a local business to replace general fund costs, offering a new course combining non-credit and credit students that increases FTE).

Guaranteed Revenue Enhancements:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR

Additional Narrative:

Since income in the Testing Office is dependent on the number of examinees who take various exams on a per fee basis, and number of examinees cannot be guaranteed, no guaranteed revenue enhancements were identified. Several non-guaranteed revenue enhancements are outlined below with reasonable projections of examinee numbers based on past volume.

Non-Guaranteed Revenue Enhancements:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
Increase proctored test fee from \$15 to \$20, total income from program listed, not additional revenue	May generate more funds, based on approx 188 proctored tests given last year	Higher fee may cause fewer students to take exams at LCC Testing Office	\$3760.00	R
Increase GED fee by \$5 to \$80, amount is	May generate more funds, based on 244	May cause a reduction in the	\$1220.00	R

Unit Planning for Student Services
Counseling/Testing

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
additional revenue generated, not total revenue.	GED examinees tested last year	number of students taking GED at Lane		
Administer CLEP tests @ \$15 each	May generate more funds, program needs extensive setup and approval from CLEP prior to offering these exams	Unknown number of students will take CLEP exams, income estimate based on 20 examinees first year	\$300.00	R
State Building Codes Exams	New program, estimate 8 – 10 examinees a month at \$10 each, volume based on UO experience with this test program	UO to discontinue being testing site for this exam, LCC will take over program.	\$960.00 to \$1200.00	R
Charge \$10 “no-show” fee for GED missed appointments	Fewer missed appointments, more efficient use of staff time	Fewer students may opt to take GED at Lane, estimate based on 15% no show rate	\$1833.00	R

Additional Narrative:

Increasing fees risks reducing the number of students to take advantage of our “pay to test” services. Discussion with the OU testing office to match our fees and reduce this risk are ongoing at this time.

As with all new programs, there is no guarantee that the existing audience will materialize. These are best guess estimates. The collection of test fees may further burden the cashiers at Enrollment Services. Optional ways to pay test fees will be explored.

- 1. Efficiencies and Productivity:** (Include impact, consequences, and comments; examples might include: increasing maximum class size, consolidating courses of two instructional programs).

Guaranteed Efficiencies/Productivity:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR

Additional Narrative:

Non-Guaranteed Efficiencies/Productivity:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
Group placement	Less time spent	Students may have	Unknown	R

Unit Planning for Student Services
Counseling/Testing

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
testing instead of individually starting students	individually with each student	to wait for start time and room to fill but would be more efficient use of staff time during peak periods		

Additional Narrative:

Group placement testing would reduce staff time spent with each student individually prior to stating the exam. During periods of peak placement testing, this would make the traffic flow more efficient, but students would have to appear at scheduled start times, instead of the current walk in-on demand testing that students have become accustomed to in the Testing Office since 1980. Savings is unknown at this time.

2. **Budget Reductions:** (Include impact, consequences, and comments; examples might include: reducing a faculty or management position in a program, reducing materials and supplies allocation).

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
Discontinue cell phone	Staff will no longer have a cell phone when traveling to outlying test centers	Used for emergency phone calls only	\$250.00	R
Reduce number and type of phones in office	Fewer stations to answer calls during peak periods	Students will wait longer to have questions answered, we will no longer have a fax machine available as it uses this phone line	\$250.00	R
Turn off computers in Testing Labs when not in use in, turn out half the lights in testing office	More efficient use of resources	Students will need to wait while computers boot up when extra capacity is needed	\$250.00	R

Additional Narrative:

Amounts listed for reduction in energy usage are best guess estimates. Reduction in phone services would impact the office during peak placement testing when the extra phones are staffed to answer questions. Our fax is also connected to this phone station.

Unit Planning for Student Services
Counseling/Testing

2008-2009 (FY 09) and beyond, Fundamental changes:

1. Revenue Enhancements: (Include impact, consequences, and comments)

Guaranteed Revenue Enhancements:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR

Additional Narrative:

Non-Guaranteed Revenue Enhancements:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
Charge \$10 for retaking placement testing	Generate revenue from re-testers, 1148 re-testers based on retest volume for 2005	Who would process fee needs to be determined	\$11,480	R

Additional Narrative:

Reinstatement of the placement testing fee for those who opt to take the test a second time would generate income to support the testing unit used by these students. Personnel responsible for collection & processing of the retest fee would need to be determined; possibly via a CRN rather than going through the cashiers at Enrollment Services.

2. Efficiencies and Productivity: (Include impact, consequences, and comments)

Guaranteed Efficiencies/Productivity:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR

Additional Narrative:

Non-Guaranteed Efficiencies/Productivity:

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR
Reduce number of GED test batteries purchased from 13 to 10	More efficient use of test materials	May have to make additional order of test materials if all used during test year	\$1575.00	R

Additional Narrative:

Ordering fewer GED test batteries will make more efficient use of test books. Reduction based on current year test book usage.

Unit Planning for Student Services
Counseling/Testing

3. Budget Reductions: (Include impact, consequences, and comments)

Description	Impact	Consequences	\$	R/NR

Additional Narrative: