

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

Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, October 1, 2021

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

Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/99163736458>

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 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
Jamal Cooks (A)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Kristina Whalen (A)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Miguel Colon (F)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Daniela Ballif (A)	<i>DIST</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
David Rodriguez (LPC)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rajeev Chopra (F)	<i>LPC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Thomas Dowire (C)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Liem Huynh (A)	<i>DIST</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Meeting Attendees: Anette Raichbart, Arnold Paguio, Billy Delos Santos Jr., Chasity Whiteside, Crystal Berry, Cynthia G. da Cruz, Craig Kutil, Dave Fouquet, Dale Wagoner, Heike Gecox, Jennifer Lange, Kirti Ready, Kyle Johnson, Megan Parker, Mona Abdoun, Noell Adams, Paulette Lino, Patricia Shannon, Ronald Gerhard, Safiyyah Forbes, Tamica Ward, Terri Anderson, Theresa Pedrosa, Jamie Barancic.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve Notes from September 3, 2021 DEMC Meeting
3. Enrollment Updates
 - a. Chabot College
 - b. Las Positas College
4. 2022-2023 UGLY Sheet Review in terms of staying the course or revising for any or all:
Program Offsets, Lab Load Factor, Non-Credit FTEF Allocations
5. FTEF/FTES Enrollment Target Discussion
6. Other

The Friday, October 1st, 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 briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.

2. **Approve Notes from September 3, 2021 DEMC Meeting**

Estella Sanchez, meeting recorder, was absent from this meeting therefore the approval of September's notes was moved to the following meeting.

3. **Enrollment Updates**

- a. Chabot College enrollment management report: Jeff Drouin shared the current DEMC dashboard for Fall. Chabot was down 9.38% over this time last year and down 20% compared to two years ago. Non-credit is up 39.26%, Jeff attributed this to the strong enrollments for the PE & healthy aging classes.
- b. Las Positas College enrollment management report: Tom Orf explained that while LPC was currently down by 10%, that number has steadily decreased from the 15% it was two months ago. Tom shared that they still have some late start classes beginning soon and they are hopeful that this number will improve even more.

4. **2022-2023 UGLY Sheet Review in terms of staying the course or revising for any or all: Program Offsets, Lab Load Factor, Non-Credit FTEF Allocations**

Theresa shared the [Original and Revised Allocation](#) handout which is posted on the DEMC website for today's meeting, and reviewed the numbers with the group. Last month VP Wagoner walked everyone through the history of this allocation sheet and there were some questions brought forward regarding offsets, lab load factor adjustments, and other changes to the UGLY sheet. Theresa and Jeff asked the committee to share their thoughts and ideas relating to the UGLY sheet, whether to keep it as is or adjust.

Jonah Nicholas recommended finding a way to estimate the full time and part time productivity rate and the cost associated with those target numbers. He felt this should be included in the recommendation to the Chancellor.

Dave Fouquet explained that figuring out the part time faculty budgets can be very complicated. Factors including non-instructional faculty members like counselors and librarians, teachers on reassignment, faculty on sabbatical, and faculty who are teaching on overloads. Dave also asked if the target number of 490 was appropriate for the current conditions, he felt that this number may be unrealistic.

Jonah responded to Dave's concerns explaining that the factors noted above are actually charged to a separate code and his office could provide what is needed.

Tom deWit noted that historically the money was kept separate from the FTEF to protect the part-time faculty, but now there is a part-time seniority list. Tom also mentioned that in previous years the district was not able to turn out an accurate projection model. Tom felt good that the current district leadership could produce something more accurate and that would be a good direction to go in.

Jonah shared his thoughts on good practices and agreed with some of the thoughts shared by Tom. Jonah did not think it was a good idea to just pick a target FTES & productivity

number and tell the colleges to hit it without factoring in the funding needed to meet those targets.

Tom noted agreement with Dave's comment that the 490 productivity target number seems very unrealistic. Tom asked the District to leave some wiggle room for the colleges.

Thomas Orf mentioned that LPC did leave a large cushion for classes this semester in fear of losing more students, and he thought this should be done again in the Spring. Thomas also agreed that neither college will be able to hit 490.

Sarah Thompson suggested setting an internal target with projection goals around 10-20% higher than the current numbers. She explained this would allow the colleges to build back and be in alignment with the SCFF (Student-Centered Funding Formula) deadline.

Jonah recommended the conversation include FTES targets while discussing the productivity target, he felt that both should be discussed if the desired outcome is to create an achievable goal.

Kristina Whalen shared some topics of conversation that had taken place at LPC's CEMC meetings and wanted to further the conversation in DEMC. With the colleges moving towards the SCFF and coming off of hold harmless, the topic of establishing criteria for offsets regardless of which college they are for arose. This led to the question of why have offsets at all in this new funding formula. The offsets act to subsidize the instruction and they almost always have done really well with SCFF outcomes because they are very high wage earning CTE producing programs. Kristina invited the group to continue this conversation and asked why subsidize the front end when it is so heavily rewarded on the back end.

Jeff agreed with Kristina that this is something that should continue to be looked at and what it will look like moving forward with allocations.

Tom agreed that this would be a good topic of discussion relating to changing the budget and the schedule as well as good planning for the future, but he hesitated with implementing any changes while still on hold harmless.

Jonah echoed Tom's opinion that implementation would most likely serve better next year, and allow for more transparency.

Tom asked Jonah for his thoughts on using the SCFF model as a basis for the district's internal funding and what the timing looks like for that.

Jonah advocated for a revenue model to replicate the way the SCFF works and the way the district is funded by the state. The recommendation to the Chancellor will likely happen in fiscal year 2023.

5. **FTEF/FTES Enrollment Target Discussion**

Jonah shared the [DEMC FTES Update](#) document posted on the DEMC website. This documents the history of FTES shortfalls the district experienced in relation to the external funding since fiscal year 2018-2019. Jonah highlighted the data for the current fiscal year 2021-22, the difference between the actuals and targets was -2,389, while the difference between the actuals and what was funded was -4,739. The variance is huge and Jonah anticipates that when the P-1 report comes out in January the district will see the number of colleges on hold harmless double.

Kristina pointed out we are currently disadvantaged because of the student attendance accounting model for distance education courses. Something to consider for the future is attendance accounting that produces more robust FTES.

Jonah explained for those who might not be aware of attendance accounting, the difficulties that come with it. In distance learning every unit receives 1 contact hour, whereas in person you can maneuver an extra 5-10 minutes in a class to get a contact hour from that. Jonah agreed that this does have a negative impact on the FTES as Kristina brought up.

Kristina ended her thought with an advocacy for changing the attendance accounting manual at the state level and coupled that with the advocacy for a change in the SCFF. Dave pointed out a missing component, the funded amount for 2021-2022 was 18,839 and the target number was 16,489. Before the pandemic the district's best was approximately 17,500 FTES so the focus should not be around getting to 18,839 because the district was never there to begin with.

Jonah then shared the second page of his document which graphed the 'Annually Generated FTES vs. FTES Goals by College'. Neither college is close to hitting their target numbers and Jonah suggested using this when preparing their recommendation to the Chancellor on next year's target.

Tom suggested adding a third line to the graph, a line showing where the district wants to take the colleges in the next 2-3 years. Tom recommended driving the FTES and keep it moving even at a lower productivity rate in order to increase student enrollments.

Theresa thanked Jonah for sharing his data and suggested that the committee move the conversation to their respective CEMC meetings. There the CEMCs could prepare their recommendation for 2022-2023 allocations and present at next month's DEMC meeting on November 5.

Thomas stressed the importance of having these numbers decided on by the end of the next meeting. This would allow the colleges the time needed to get their discipline plans out for the next year.

Dave shared the pressure felt at Chabot's CEMC meetings to cut classes that would be productive which he found to be unsettling. Classes with at least 15 enrollments in the first two weeks were to be preserved for face to face instruction and the colleges were trying to preserve classes with at least 10 enrollments as well. The low enrollment classes that were kept lowered the productivity number. Dave added that to do this properly the FTEF number needed to be higher and he did not believe the district had planned for that. Dave noted that by lowering the 490 it will drive more FTEF to the colleges, which in return will allow the colleges to maintain the classes with lower enrollments. Dave concluded that the colleges seem to be underfunded for Spring 2022 and will not be able to maintain the classes needed if they keep the classes with low enrollments.

Thomas wanted to clarify that there were not classes cut with high productivity at LPC.

Tom added that Dave's sentiments were probably more geared toward what had happened at Chabot.

Jamal Cooks clarified that classes with large enrollments were not cut this fall. During the spring when the Deans met they were asked to decrease FTEF by 30 and then the District provided FTEF for the Sheriff's Academy, so that meant the decrease was really 15. After presenting that to CEMC the senior leadership decided to move forward with the 15. Jamal explained that the flexibility needed in order to serve the students is the priority while also maintaining the allocation.

Theresa reiterated that the district has always taken the position to serve student demand and if there are overflowing classes, then FTEF would be put onto the schedule.

Kristina asked Theresa if there was still a plan to draft a worksheet allocation model that would be given to the colleges prior to their CEMC meetings. Kristina recalled hearing this notion at a previous meeting, the draft could then be used as a starting point for conversations at the colleges.

Theresa clarified that the statement Kristina was referring to was an incorporation of a dollar figure onto the allocation worksheet. This would help to keep the budget in mind while running through different scenarios.

Kristina recalled last year that Ron, while serving in Jonah's position, did present a suggestion that the colleges worked from.

Theresa replied that Kristina's idea was a very pragmatic suggestion and she would like to be able to pull back and have time to consult before responding to the College Presidents and Vice Presidents of Instruction.

Jonah added that while a spreadsheet is easy to create, the data used needs to be universally accepted and widely agreed upon before creation.

Theresa concluded the discussion by thanking Kristina for her suggestion and noted that she would get back to the College Presidents and Vice Presidents of Instruction on the matter.

6. **Other**

Thomas requested a future meeting agenda item. He recommended there be tri-chair leadership for this committee in which a representative from the District, Chabot College, and Las Positas College were represented.