

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

Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, October 2, 2020

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

Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/96979935638>

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"/>
Ronald Gerhard (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"/>
Barbara Yesnosky (A)	<i>DO</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thomas Dowrie (C)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Heidi Ulrech (C)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Eric Stricklen (C)	<i>DO</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Meeting Attendees: Tamica Ward, Rajinder Samra, Paulette Lino, Patricia Shannon, Noell Adams, Najla Abrao, Craig Kutil, Chasity Whiteside, Bobby Nakamoto, Arnold Paguio, Annette Raichbart-Saxe, Terri Anderson, Estella Sanchez, Jamie Barancic

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve Notes from September 4, 2020 DEMC Meeting
3. Enrollment Updates
 - a. DEMC Dashboard
 - b. Non-Credit Enrollment Report
4. 2021-2022 FTES Enrollment Targets
5. Generate Agenda Items for DEMC during 2020-2021
6. Other

The Friday, October 2, 2020 District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) meeting was opened by Theresa Fleischer Rowland.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Theresa welcomed everyone to the DEMC meeting.

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

Theresa moved the meeting to the approval of the September 4, 2020 meeting notes and asked the Committee to review the notes. She then asked for a motion to approve the meeting notes. Tom Orf made a motion, seconded by Sarah Thompson. Rajinder noted that there needed to be a correction to his comment under Enrollment Updates, Part B, Paragraph 2 which was a nuanced remark about average units per student. Theresa asked to move with this one correction, Estella acknowledged she would make the correction. Tom Orf made the motion, seconded by Sarah Thompson, meeting notes approved.

3. **Enrollment Updates**

- a. Theresa shared the current weekly DEMC Dashboard enrollment report with the Committee. Theresa noted improvements have been made as per last month's DEMC discussion. For example, the report has been updated to now produce total number of units (column N). As requested by the DEMC and supported by the work group last year, the DEMC "Dashboard" will continue to be sent to the Senior Leadership Team and the DEMC mailing list regularly from the ESSS Office. Theresa invited further suggestions on improvements. Rajinder noted that there is a difference between the unit decrease percentage and the FTES percentage and asked that maybe in the future that is something to look into.
- b. Eric shared the non-credit data Argos report comparing Fall terms, and mentioned for those wanting information about noncredit, there is an option built into the Argos report. Eric reminded the committee that they do not collect headcount units or units.

Comments/questions followed on the enrollment reports. Theresa recounts from last month when VP Whalen stated they were doing some manual enrollments in non-credit, not sure about Chabot, are we seeing a difference this month with non-credit. Rajeev asked about the difference in WSCH numbers for Chabot and LPC. Eric responded that WSCH numbers mean less enrollments, in turn equal less value. Theresa asked if we are seeing the movement we expected. Kristina offered to look into that more when on campus. Theresa noted it would be good to agendize noncredit for more attention as a future discussion. Dave Fouquet asked does this pick up positive attendance stuff or is that for the end of term. Kristina and Stacy both stated that those numbers are not turned in until the end of the semester, therefore Fall 2020 numbers are premature. Paulette agreed. Eric confirmed that Argos projection for the Fall 2020 numbers are at 65%. The question was posted to the committee when or if Dashboard was going to be used as our data source for future meetings. Jeff suggested moving on with the agenda and tabling the topics for another time.

4. **2021-2022 FTES Enrollment Targets**

Jeff introduced the 2021-2022 FTES Enrollment Target discussion based on numbers given by Ron last month. Jeff and Theresa met prior to this DEMC to compile the numbers as a starting point. Theresa shared a pre-populated DEMC FTES to FTEF Target worksheet with the committee with the sole purpose to have a starting point for discussion. Theresa explained the numbers used in the pre-populated worksheet were brought over from the enrollment analysis they went through with Ron at September 4 DEMC, and can be found on the DEMC webpage. Theresa explains how the sheet works and where the numbers come from, how the numbers are separated by college, FTES (green) and FTEF (blue), productivity number is 490. Jeff and Theresa called for comments. Dave explained the numbers in column L or starting point numbers are not the same reduction per college. Because if you look at the numbers to left in column F, and G, don't they reflect 3.8% reduction of the previous targets, but it looks like these numbers are showing a bigger drop for LPC than Chabot. He explained that he is trying to figure out why that was. Jeff said he was taking actuals from 19-20, Chabot was 3% off target and LPC about 5% off target which did not allow us to use Ron's numbers without changing the split. Dale explained the FTEF never matches because of the offsets we have. If you take the FTEF split versus the FTES split they will never match up, math will not allow it.

Miguel explained how the target numbers are almost unrealistic, that number has not been reached since 2014, just looking at Chabot, therefore we are setting ourselves up to fail. Miguel expressed strong concern why we can't use more realistic number. Tom deWit agreed with Miguel.

Stacy explained how in another group meeting they also looked at productivity numbers and realized we would not be able to make 490 even if we had every seat filled. They discovered with the courses on the schedule, Chabot couldn't get to 490 which was very revealing. Jeff stated that it took about 5 years' worth of good data to get the right numbers so it's going to take a while to get to another proper number now, this is not something we can come up with quickly. And in the meantime, we need to have a target and we can't just pick a lower number, there are so many factors.

Miguel stated he appreciated that perspective, but these numbers drive budget. The concern is that we are putting up unreachable numbers and building our spending around those numbers and running another deficit. When spending money, we should be taking a more conservative approach. Stacy states it is a bigger conversation with many factors, adding we need a strategy that moves us toward what makes sense.

Tom deWit would like a more realistic productivity number so the budgets are closer to right-sized at the colleges. In the meanwhile, we need to take a deeper look at the program mix, the one at Chabot is "pretty baked in". In order to get Chabot above 490 we would be looking at a completely different college. We are in a pandemic and we need to be handling it that way.

Dave F made two observations: if we are to be more realistic on the FTEF targets then we would drive FTEF allocation down, but lower WSCH would drive FTEF up therefore creating a larger offset. Miguel stated that is his point -- in order for Chabot to hit 9878 FTES we have to offer more classes and pay an instructor and that is what impacts budget. He pointed out our general fund allocates a little more than 50% to instruction and how do we balance that if we are only looking at instruction? We should be taking a more holistic approach to spending, not just instruction.

Jeff asks for any more comments. Are we ready to vote? Tom DeWit asks if we are voting on only productivity or as a package. Tom Orf explains we need to vote as a package in order to get this information out. Tom deWit wants to know if Tom Orf can live with these numbers, Tom Orf says yes, he can live with 490.

Tom deWit suggests 470 would make more sense and be a more realistic productivity number. Ron explains that due to expected financial headwinds he is trying to get ahead of the curve. Ron agrees when looking at the recent data 490 does seem high but by lowering it to 470 it affects other areas like more sections, which comes back to Miguel's comments on budget pressure concerns we all have. Ron says he is ok with being real and setting a real WSCH per FTEF but given the circumstances we are trying to address that would then have a decrease in FTES targets beyond what we discussed last week. Ron concluded if we change to a number closer to 470 but keep the targets the same that means more FTEF on schedule; equaling more classes, which is not helping the budget stress.

Miguel replied, saying he knows we have a multi-year transition underway and wants to know if we could set up an incremental plan that increases annually over 3 years, but the budget does not change. Ron said there has been some thought to that idea since April, but things during this recession are so much different than those in the past and new information wasn't available in April.

Theresa opens it up for concluding comments. Dave F in order to get WSCH per FTEF up you need the demand from the students for classes and the willingness of the instructors to be overloaded with extra students.

Theresa puts the DEMC FTES to FTEF Target worksheet back up for the committee to view. Theresa suggests thinking long-term and adding a discussion on a 3 year plan to the November agenda or as a future item to discuss.

The Co-Chairs discuss taking a vote to see where the committee is on the proposed numbers showing on the worksheet. Tom Orf motions to accept the numbers for planning purposes based on the sheet. Sarah Thompson seconds the motion. Theresa calls for a roll call vote led by Estella: Tom D Abstain, Jeff Yes, Sarah Yes, Tom Yes, Susan Abstain, Dyrell Yes, Theresa Yes, Ron Abstain. Motion Passes using rules of simple majority.

5. **Generate Agenda Items for DEMC during 2020-2021**

- Non credit
- 3 year Targets

6. **Other**

The DEMC FTES to FTEF Targets worksheet will be cleaned up by Theresa and emailed to the DEMC mailing list. The Targets will become the formal recommendation to the Chancellor for the 2021-22 academic year.