

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Office of Educational Services & Student Success

Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, February 5, 2021

10:30 A.M. - 12:00 P.M.

Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/94689006066>

DEMC Membership

VOTING

		Present
Tom deWit (F)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jeff Drouin (F)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tom Orf (F)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sarah Thompson (F)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Susan Sperling (A)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dyrell Foster (A)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Theresa Fleischer Rowland (A)	<i>DIST</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jonah Nicholas (A)	<i>DIST</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

NON-VOTING

		Present
Stacy Thompson (A)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Miguel Colon (F)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Kristina Whalen (A)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rajeev Chopra (F)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Thomas Dowrie (C)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Heidi Ulrech (C)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Liem Huynh (C)	<i>DIST</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Meeting Attendees: Anette Raichbart, Angela Castellanos, Chasity Whiteside, Craig Kutil, Christina Read, Cynthia Gordon Da Cruz, Dale Wagoner, Dave Fouquet, David Rodriguez, Dawn Neideffer, Deonne Kunkel Wu, Jennifer Aries, Jon Palacio Jr, Kirti Reddy, Najla Abrao, Na Liu, Noell Adams, Patricia Shannon, Paulette Lino, Rachel Ugale, Rajinder Samra, Ronald Gerhard, Tamica Ward, Estella Sanchez, Jamie Barancic.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve Notes from December 4, 2020 DEMC Meeting
3. Enrollment Updates
 - a. DEMC Dashboard
 - b. Chabot College
 - c. Las Positas College
4. 2021 Enrollment Analysis and revisiting targets for 2021-2022
5. Summary and Next Steps
6. Other

The Friday, February 5, 2021 District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) meeting was opened by Theresa Fleischer Rowland.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Theresa welcomed everyone to the DEMC meeting and shared the meeting agenda, reminding everyone that due to the conversation to be had, it was important to note the next scheduled meeting is Friday, March 5, 2021.

2. **Approve Notes from December 4, 2020 DEMC Meeting**

Estella requested the approval of the December 4, 2020 meeting notes. Sarah Thompson made the motion to approve, seconded by Jonah Nicholas.

3. **Enrollment Updates**

- a. Theresa shared the current DEMC Dashboard report for Spring 2021. Theresa stated if anyone would like to be added to the email distribution every Monday morning, to put a note in the chat. The DEMC Dashboards (weekly enrollment updates in spreadsheet form) are open to anyone who wishes to see them.
- b. Chabot College enrollment management report: Stacy Thompson commented that they do not have any new or exciting information since the last meeting. Jeff Drouin explained that they are down 5.8% for Spring 21 and that number has remained steady week after week.
- c. Las Positas enrollment management report: Tom Orf shared that LPC is down 8.62% and that (as a comparison) number reflects the fact there is no Sherriff's Academy at LPC this year. He does not predict that number to change very much in the future. Even with a few late start classes, there are usually cancellations that come around census time and those figures will basically cancel each other out.

4. **2021 Enrollment Analysis and revisiting targets for 2021-2022**

Theresa moved the meeting to the revisiting of the enrollment targets for 2021-2022. Theresa acknowledged the amount of work and effort that has gone into the reduction of these targets, and began the conversation by recapping the history. In October 2020, the targets were developed and voted on by DEMC as recommended FTES/FTEF target to Chancellor Gerhard. Chancellor Gerhard responded with a memo, as is the protocol. At the November meeting DEMC talked about the chancellor's response (memo), Theresa paraphrased the memo that stated the Chancellor would accept the targets with one caveat that we'd need to keep an eye on Spring 21 enrollments and if we were seeing reduced student demand, DEMC would revisit the targets in February/March 2021. At the time, we knew fall enrollments were already down 14% overall. The agreement was made to take a look again in February/March to see if there was a need for any further reduction. These documents and meeting notes are posted on the DEMC website.

At the January CEMC meetings, Chancellor Gerhard shared an enrollment analysis based on P-1 report numbers (handout) and suggested a sound revenue restoration decision would be to further reduce FTES by 3.82% reduction over 2021-22, exceeding student demand and still providing access but reducing expenses. The DEMC Dashboards consistently show the reduced student demand. Acknowledgement was made of the difficulty of the COVID-19

pandemic on student lives, the inability to teach F2F, and students' feedback to us about the challenges of online learning. Theresa shared the handout, 2020-21 Enrollment Analysis that Ron prepared for the CEMCs.

Jeff walked through the handout starting with the P-1 report column. The spreadsheet shows the target recommendation and how the spring enrollments are expected to trend. With the enrollment numbers down, Ron came to the CEMC meeting in January and proposed a reduction of about 4%. Jeff noted that at Chabot, they have been discussing the feasibility of doing that.

Theresa asked the group, per the DEMC charge, to share thoughts, issues, and methods for preparing for the 4% reduction, an exchange that can benefit all, beginning with the Vice Presidents of Instruction.

Stacy Thompson stressed the fact that there has been a lot of time and conversation put towards looking at these numbers and planning for the future.

Kristina Whalen shared that at LPC they have really looked into what the methodology will be to make the reduction while protecting access and completion. There has also been talk of pulling numbers from what the normal attrition has been, and if another reduction could be reached through typical enrollment management without adding on demand.

Tom Orf requested to see the "UGLY Sheet" showing the breakout. Theresa shared her screen (this was not a handout, only the CEMC leads had access due to the worksheet nature of the document). The Sheet reflected the proposed reduction with revised numbers, showing an FTES target for 2021-2022 as 16,295. Using the same percentages, that would allocate 9,422 FTES to Chabot and 6,873 FTES to Las Positas for the 2021-22 year. Theresa opened the floor to comments and discussion.

Stacy shared the Chabot process in relation to the reduction. In conversations with the Deans, they have gone course by course to look at the enrollments, faculty assignments, adjunct faculty, and the costs for each of those classes. Keeping focus on the effort to not cancel classes that students need to graduate, classes that are already full, or any core classes.

Ron explained his somewhat unusual approach by attending each college's CEMC meeting and his request for them to have a conversation prior to the DEMC meeting. Reiterating the fact that in Fall 20 there was a plan to put a pin in the discussion and then, if enrollments continued to decline, the DEMC would need to revisit the conversation. The 4% number did not come as a recommendation from the district or Ron himself, but in response to the CEMC asking how much we are talking about additionally. This number was essentially a response to allow the district to get the targets where they were needed for an additional reduction, while maintaining access. While comparing numbers from where we were, and what we reported to the state on January 15 for P-1, and the UGLY sheet, the additional 4% would still leave room for restoration of over 1000 FTES for the entire district. Ron also recognized the difficulty of this conversation due to the content related to maintain student services, assignments, and employment. The 4% was meant to be an illustrative example. It

was created so the conversations about maintaining that 1000 plus FTES restoration, in terms of access, could begin. While also dealing with the unfortunate economics we are faced with during a pandemic and adjusting to the funding formula. Ron concluded with a hopeful outlook that the students will come back, and that there are good recruitment and advertising plans in place.

Miguel Colon asked why the district did not go to the colleges and give them a number they needed to cut back on expense wise, and why it seems as though the conversations seem to be mostly about impacting faculty and not the deans or administrators. Miguel mentioned there are other tools that can be used such as furlough or not renewing contracts for unnecessary positions. Miguel reiterated the need for an answer since the only area asked to cut back is instruction.

Ron responded that the DEMC charge is FTEF/FTES enrollment target numbers, and that there have been cuts in both classified and administrative positions as well as defunded positions. So, although that content has not come up in DEMC, these conversations have taken place in other meetings such as PBC.

Susan Sperling explained how Chabot College is unique in the way that it has been able to supplement the general fund with categorical funding. Additionally, actions like the Hispanic Serving Institution Director and the Equity Director position were funded through additional money, not the general fund. There have also been a lot of positions that have been frozen or moved to other areas of necessity within the college.

Tom deWit recognized that there have been massive reductions to adjunct faculty in the district already and these are people with lives, and bills, and family, and to be mindful of that in this committee and to recognize that. Tom deWit also pointed out that the 1000 restoration number is wrong and it is actually 490, which neither college is even close to. To really further the conversation the number would need to be truer, right now it is set up as a failing situation. Tom deWit also asked for the meeting minutes to show that as access is restored and the district is built back up, that the FTEF will be there, maybe even in a reserve account. Tom DeWit noted that there were 1500 students dropped due to non-payment at a time when there were millions of dollars of student aid available from the federal and state level. Tom DeWit also wanted the minutes to show that as a college, the processes are inhibiting or even thwarting enrollments, and he requested that these processes are looked into immediately.

Ron agreed with Tom deWit's statements and acknowledged the amount of difficult content that comes with these conversations.

Dave Fouquet expressed his concern with the process in which the cuts are made. In the past it seemed as though larger disciplines were expected to make cuts because there were more areas to choose from, so in turn, they were expected to give up 1 or 2 FTEF. But then there comes a pressure for those disciplines to start cutting back classes that are approaching full and how is that appropriate in terms of restoring access. Dave also asked in terms of budget, how does the 4% decrease affect the amount of money given to the colleges. And since the

district is on hold harmless and there is CRSSA money, and possibly more relief money coming in terms of schools reopening, that the focus should be on retaining access for the students.

Dale Wagoner responded that a cut of 25 FTEF is a reduction to Chabot in the amount of \$800-900k in the current budget allocation model, which will reduce the budget by over \$1 million. Cuts will be made and revenue will be diminished because that is how the budget model is set up.

Tom Orf responded to the comments made in regard to the large disciplines. The small disciplines have so little to choose from that there becomes a risk of affecting the actual degree programs. Tom Orf recommended looking at these cuts area by area, and not just by discipline.

Miguel agreed to some of the points made earlier and asked why cuts will be made to the areas that are bringing in revenue. He shared his concern for restricting access, especially in a time that online classes are available anywhere, maybe the district should be offering more classes instead of less. Miguel also noted that there should be some monies coming in that can help the district grow and balance out over a semester or two.

Sarah Thompson stated “workload reduction” as a term masks that we are talking about laying off professional colleagues. She then asked for clarification from Chabot College as to the reduction of 4%. If they were not comfortable with this number, then what number is Chabot college thinking or do they have a recommendation ready yet.

Jeff explained that they are not necessarily opposed to the numbers, but it is a question of the ability to attain those numbers. If Chabot gets put in a position to cut full classes or almost full, and then how would that be benefiting the students.

Stacy commented that there are currently no decisions made for Chabot College and they are talking through and will need another meeting before making any recommendations to the district.

Theresa explained the DEMC is not at the same level of the CEMC and there is a need for interaction and exchange. The purpose of the committee is to look at what it will take, how much time will it take, and the impact on students, programs, and schedules. Theresa noted that the consensus appears to be that both colleges processes are underway and at this point there needs to be more dialogue before a proposed cut percentage can be shared with the group.

Tom deWit shared Chabot College is not against reductions. In fact, they are spending hours of meetings having good dialogue. He then asked Ron and Jonah Nicholas how they plan to provide FTEF next spring if things pick up and a large number of students come back.

Jonah explained that there have been some dollars set aside through things like SCFF rollback, and allocations through PBC, so we could look at putting some of those savings into

an account for potential course correction mid-year. This would be tied to some level of metrics for release of these dollars and scheduled for spring. Jonah also mentioned that there have been multiple references to what can be done with the money from the federal stimulus dollars. There has yet to be any clear guidance on what that money can be used for, but Jonah would be happy to use that for continuing student access.

Ron emphasized the need to be mindful and methodical in this process. And agreeing with Jonah, if the district can get to census, meaning after Labor Day, and there are signs of restoration, then the desire to restore FTEF will be there. Ron reminded the group of the rollback money in the tune of \$8M, and an allocated \$7M was given to the colleges in support of the schedules. Ron also explained that these processes are not about working towards making more money, but to save expenses and being able to restore the FTES and prevent cuts to the revenue. Revenue preservation, not revenue regeneration. He asserted the district will get back to 17,649 FTES.

Dave wanted to mention the need for not cutting so deep and losing more students, and also to be able to add classes quickly back when the demand is there, and prepare ahead for a possible surge of student enrollment.

Patricia Shannon noted the lack of conversation in regard to what Tom deWit brought up earlier. If there is going to be a hold on 1000 in reserves, then the productivity discussions needs to happen to set a level.

Jeff ended the meeting with the idea that each college needs to meet separately and discuss what they are comfortable with. He proposed a special DEMC meeting for each college to present their recommendations.

5. **Summary and Next Steps**

Theresa summarized: A special DEMC meeting will be scheduled for voting members. Estella and Theresa to look at scheduling and set that up for as soon as possible, aiming for February 10, 2021 based on the processes underway with the CEMCs.

6. **Other**