

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

Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, September 3, 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 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 type="checkbox"/>
Miguel Colon (F)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Daniela Ballif (A)	<i>DIST</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 Dowire (C)	<i>CC</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Heidi Ulrech (C)	<i>LPC</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Liem Huynh (A)	<i>DIST</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Meeting Attendees: Abby Patton, Anette Raichbart, Angela Castellanos, Billy Delos Santos Jr., Bobby Nakamoto, Christina Read, Craig Kutil, Dave Fouquet, Dale Wagoner, David Rodriguez, Deonne Kunkel, Erika D., Heike Gecox, Jamal Cooks, Jeanne Wilson, Jennifer Aries, Jennifer Lange, Kirti Ready, Kyle Johnson, Matt Kritscher, Nathaniel Rice, Paulette Lino, Patricia Shannon, Rajinder Samra, Ronald Gerhard, Safiyyah Forbes, Tamica Ward, Theresa Pedrosa, Estella Sanchez, Jamie Barancic, Terri Anderson.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approve Notes from July 15 and August 16, 2021 DEMC Meetings
3. Enrollment Updates
 - a. Chabot College
 - b. Las Positas College
4. History of FTEF "Offsets" Allocation
5. Generate Agenda Items for DEMC during 2021-2022
 - a. 2022-2023 FTES Enrollment Targets
 - b. Support and recommendation to ESS Committee for further Faculty Professional Development: Summer of 2022

6. Other

The Friday, September 3rd, 2021 District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) meeting was opened by Theresa Fleischer Rowland.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Theresa shared the meeting agenda with the group and welcomed everyone to the DEMC meeting which included special recognition to students who were in attendance. Theresa noted the value of hearing from students and welcomed their participation.

2. **Approve Notes from July 15 and August 16, 2021 DEMC Meetings**

Estella Sanchez, meeting recorder, called for the approval of the July 15, 2021 meeting notes. Thomas Orf made the motion to approve, seconded by Jonah Nicholas. Estella then called for the approval of the August 16, 2021 meeting notes. Thomas Orf made the motion to approve, seconded by Jonah Nicholas.

3. **Enrollment Updates**

a. Chabot College enrollment management report: Jeff Drouin shared the current DEMC dashboard for Fall. Chabot is down just under 8% from last year and about 17% compared to the previous three years. The WSCH numbers are also slightly down and Jeff acknowledged hold harmless is helping. Non-credit is up almost 34% from last year, and up 7% compared to the previous three years. Jeff added CEMC is working on strategies to increase enrollment. The new Vice President for Academic Services is TBA.

b. Las Positas enrollment management report: Tom Orf reminded the group that they were down by about 15% last month and now enrollment is improving at 11.6% down. Tom also shared that like Chabot, LPC is working on strategies to improve enrollment trends before the spring semester.

Sarah Thompson shared a strategy plan that Los Medanos College used that was quite successful. They had faculty members and counselors reach out to students directly, starting mid-summer, who had applied but not yet enrolled. They were able to reduce their deficit from 14% to 7% and they attributed almost all of that to their outreach plan. Sarah mentioned that this might be a topic for PBC, but wanted to make this group aware of an inter-personal touch that worked very well for Los Medanos. Theresa asked if the students who were in the meeting had any thoughts on this type of outreach.

Theresa Pedrosa agreed that this could be a great way to connect with the students because there are a large number who apply but never register.

Kyle Johnson added that applying for college can be a scary experience for prospective students and by reaching out personally it would allow for the colleges to build stronger relationships with the students. Kyle noted that he would have greatly appreciated this type of outreach as a prospective student.

Anette Raichbart informed the group that Las Positas is currently recruiting students to work as student guides and to help with recruitment and calling students. Anette agreed that having an assigned group of employees also reaching out would be a great idea.

Theresa added that this type of outreach could also foster a relationship with the students once they are on campus. It would be a way to start an ongoing personal relationship and help the students feel more connected. Theresa thanked Sarah for bringing this idea forward and stated that this could be the start of something really incredible.

4. **History of FTEF “Offsets” Allocation**

Theresa informed the committee that she and Jeff led a prep meeting on the material to be presented, a subgroup of DEMC members with representation from both colleges were invited based on longevity with the district, DEMC, and enrollment management. In that meeting it was decided Dale Wagoner would lead the informational item today. The [8/31/21 Prep Meeting Notes](#) were taken by Theresa and can be found on the DEMC website. Jeff shared a few reasons why Dale was entrusted to share during this meeting, one being that there is a long history to these elements and how they ended up on the UGLY sheet (the form used to publish FTES/FTEF allocations). Dale has worked for the district for a long time and he has a great understanding of the history and processes. The intent of this history lesson is to inform all and benefit future DEMC meetings and help the committee in the handling of questions around the FTEF allocations.

Dale shared the ‘Revised CLPCCD Allocation of FTEF by FTES 2021-22’ with the group, this report is commonly known as the UGLY sheet. FTEF stands for Full Time Equivalent Faculty. The current allocation of FTEF for Chabot College is 618.7 and 438.9 for Las Positas College. The ultimate end point of this sheet is FTEF numbers are generated by the FTES targets, the current FTES for Chabot College is 9534 and 6955 for Las Positas College. FTES stands for Full Time Equivalent Student.

The district is funded through the State by FTES, and historically funded through the SB361 model. Through reported FTES, millions of dollars come to the district which is then distributed to the campuses by a different committee known as PBC. PBC is responsible for the money that is used to fund the instruction side. Dale noted it is important to understand that those two numbers (FTES and FTEF) are implicitly tied to each other. Another important factor shared was the productivity number, WSCH per FTEF, WSCH stands for Weekly Student Contact Hour. Different districts use different calculations but our district uses the WSCH per FTEF calculation to indicate productivity targets. The standard model would be 1 instructor per 35 students for a 3-unit lecture class. Not all classes are 3-unit lecture classes and there are different calculations to meet other classes. The WSCH/FTEF numbers inform us on how many FTES we need, but the key point here is that you have to hit the level of productivity that you plan for.

During the college enrollment updates we saw that both Chabot and LPC’s WSCH/FTEF is currently lower than the target number is 490. So, we know that we do not currently have enough students enrolled in classes to meet our FTES targets. There are also 2 types of offsets, the Non-Credit offset is at both campuses and then Chabot also has the Nursing & Dental Hygiene program offset. Non-Credit generates a higher WSCH because it has higher productivity. Nursing & Dental Hygiene have external accreditation requirements that require lower student per faculty rates. While these offset classes reduce our productivity, they are extremely important in serving the community and providing education to rewarding and well-paying careers. Chabot College is also one of the few community colleges whose students get clinic rotations in Children’s Hospital.

Another reason for this dialogue today is our district is preparing to switch to a new funding formula, the SCFF formula. SCFF stands for Student Centered Funding Formula. The SCFF formula is only 70% based on FTES, when previously we were funded on 100% FTES. The SCFF formula includes 10% funding based on a success metric, this includes the Nursing & Dental Hygiene programs. The state realized that CTE programs should be funded in different ways, one of those being a living wage. The Nursing & Dental Hygiene programs are two of the highest living wage programs provided by the district and the SCFF funding model helps recognize more funding for these programs. Now the DEMC committee is embarking on dialogue around the program offset targets and if we should continue or not. With the SCFF, which is a different funding model, and Hold Harmless ending in 2024-25, PBC is also having these conversations if we keep funding the way we do. Dale concluded his explanation of how things run now, and then went into his explanation of how the district got to where we are now.

Dale shared the CLPCCD Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2006-07 and highlighted some of the differences. There were more offsets listed at that time including: Physical Education, Vocational “360” Bin, Sherriff’s Academy, and a Temporary/“Watch” offset. The Target FTES number then was higher at Chabot College (10,480) and lower at Las Positas College (6,280), while the Main Group WSCH/FTEF was the same (490). Part of this is attributed to the split, in 2006-07 it was 63% Chabot College and 37% Las Positas College, while currently it is 58.5% Chabot College and 41.5% Las Positas College.

Theresa reminded the group that the numbers being shared by Dale were the target numbers, not the actuals, since DEMC’s charge is only to set targets.

Dave Fouquet added that when the district started enrollment management the main group number was operating around 430, the enrollments at Chabot College were stagnant, but there was population growth in the area surrounding Las Positas College. This created a growth cap of about 1.5% and LPC was able to get funded for all of it which was great for the district.

Dale then highlighted the spreadsheet showing the 3.46% growth increase LPC had during the 2006-07 school year, Chabot’s number was 0%. This created an increase of FTES targets from 6070 to 6280 for Las Positas College.

Next, Dale shared the CLPCCD Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2010-11. The FTES targets for Chabot College increased from 9,681 (in 2009-10) to 10,041 with a .8% growth increase. The FTES targets for Las Positas College increased from 6,946 (in 2009-10) to 7,001 with a .79% growth increase. The offsets were the same as in 2006-07 with the exception of the absence of the Temporary/“Watch” offset. The main group numbers increased at both colleges to 527.5, due to the increase in productivity.

Dale acknowledged that people want to know what a good target number would be for the Main Group WSCH/FTEF, Dale shared that most people consider 525 as the gold standard, meaning 35 students in a 3-unit lecture class, as mentioned previously this standard isn’t possible for all courses.

Dale then shared the CLPCCD Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2013-14. This year showed a significant change, Non-Credit was introduced into the offset column. This was also during the time when the state cut funding so that is why Physical Education was removed (due to repeatability and PE funding was capped), the Vocational “360” Bin was eliminated, and there was no Sherriff’s Academy offset for LPC this year. This year was the year Lab Load

Factor Adjustment entered into the UGLY sheet. This lowered the productivity rate because the district was paying instructors more for certain labs, but not giving them more students. Dale made the recommendation to get rid of the Lab Load Factor as DEMC moves forward and just move that all into productivity.

Lastly, Dale shared the CLPCCD Allocation of FTEF by FTES for 2014-15. This year the Sherriff's Academy was added back into Las Positas College's offset column with an allocated 7.0 FTEF, and the credit main group number was 520.

Dale wanted to also make the group aware that the Nursing & Dental Hygiene program offsets is the only offset historically that has been recognized through the PBC process by driving dollars from the district proper to Chabot College. Whereas the other offsets never received specific dollars accounted for in the district budget.

Dave noted that there was a new BAM in 2013-14. Prior to that, the district was simply using its best professional expertise to build a schedule had to make the FTES targets because there was no direct funding. He also explained his thoughts on the lab load factor and that while the instructors are paid more they are being paid more in terms of FTEF. So, if the lab load was to be taken away there may need to be an increase in the main group.

Tom deWit commented on the collegial conversations that have taken place over the years between the colleges and the district and shared his appreciation for the history lesson and how this context will help in discussions moving forward.

Dale added that with the new state funding formula in place, now would be a good time to decide what offsets or how much offsets are needed.

Jonah Nicholas asked between the two colleges if the full time to part time ratio was roughly the same, if there was a desire to fund the full-time equivalent faculty, and what that ratio is. Dale did not believe the ratios were currently the same. He also mentioned that the FON (faculty obligation number) was another area looked at, but it had not been reevaluated by the district in the way that Jonah was referencing.

Theresa thanked Dale and everyone in the meeting for sharing their perspectives and contributing to the rich dialogue. The topic came up during the last DEMC meeting in regards to FTEF offsets for the Sherriff's Academy. Theresa and Jeff wanted to continue the conversation and further examine the history in hopes that future questions and discussions will be more easily had. Theresa informed the group that this item would again be on the meeting agenda for October.

5. Generate Agenda Items for DEMC during 2021-2022

Theresa moved to the next agenda item and reminded the group that the charge and purpose of the DEMC committee is not part of the integrated planning and budget model. The DEMC committee comes together to fulfill the FA contract, specifically Article 26, to set enrollment targets each year.

- a. 2022-2023 FTES Enrollment Targets: Jeff let the committee know that the Committee would be moving into discussions on enrollment targets for 2022-2023 in order to prepare a recommendation for the Chancellor. He noted further discussion topics included: revisiting the formula used last year, revisiting what the district experienced in lower student demand that caused a reduction in 2020-21 FTEF/FTES targets, and allowance to increase FTEF depending on increased enrollment numbers.

Thomas (Orf) recommended that the discussion start at the October DEMC meeting and be completed by the November meeting. It would be optimal to be able to hand out the discipline plans to the faculty before winter break.

Tom (deWit) agreed with Thomas's recommendation and added that there might need to be a plan for iterations as well due to the ongoing pandemic.

- b. Support and recommendation to ESS Committee for further Faculty Professional Development: Summer of 2022: Theresa brought forth to the committee the idea of a district-wide effort to plan in advance for faculty professional development for the summer of 2022. In the summer of 2020 there was district-wide effort to scaffold a faculty p.d. plan very quickly. It went well with the model of relying upon expertise of faculty mentors and DE coordinators. Theresa stated she was bringing this to the DEMC committee and hoped by suggesting in advance, a broader discussion could take place. This would allow time to discuss some of the positives to online instruction as well as what the students who prefer online learning will be expecting. There is an opportunity to research and pull up national models to help with planning and building. Theresa's recommendation was for the colleges to discuss this topic at their CEMC meetings to see if there is support for this item, what further thoughts there are, and if there is college level support before recommending to the ESS committee. The recommendation to the ESS committee comes from the charge of ESS being around the educational initiatives and allocation of resources beyond those outlines in the budget allocation model. Theresa asked the group to share their thoughts and comments.

Sarah Thompson questioned the purpose of bringing this matter through DEMC and CEMC since they are not responsible for academic and professional matters.

Tom (deWit) understood the reasoning behind what Sarah was saying, and also appreciated the professional development Theresa spoke on. Tom felt that the current situation of where the district is and where it will be after the pandemic is so complicated that it would make sense to discuss it in many different arenas and hear other suggestions.

Patricia Shannon applauded the notion of providing professional development and how discussing best practices would be a benefit to many, especially now that everyone has had almost two years of experience in this new modality.

Theresa added that if the topic does move forward there is support from the Chancellor with the allocation of funds. She also gave her apologies to anyone who may have felt as though toes were being stepped on or the topic was prematurely being discussed. Her intent in raising the topic was to see if early planning and preparation could be done in a time when things usually have to happen rapidly due to covid.

No further comments were made and the meeting was adjourned.