



**Enrollment Management Committee**

**1:00 pm - 3:00 pm on October 29, 2020**

Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/98580482964>

**MINUTES**

**Attending Members:** Geisce Ly (Admin Co-Chair), Wynd Kaufmyn (Faculty Co-Chair), Monika Liu, Gregoria Cahill, Denise Selleck, Edgar Torres, Angelica Nevarez, Luisangela Marcano Gonzalez, Chandra Edelstein, Colin Hall, and Aurelien Draï

**Resource Attendees:** Pamela Mery (Resource), Elizabeth Coria (Resource), and Leslie Milloy (Resource)

**Alternate Attendees:** Monique Pascual, Simon Hanson, Joseph Reyes, Steven Brown, Vaishali Jogi, Arlette Marcial, and Jeevan Rijal

**Guests:** Tom Boegel, Mitra Sapienza, Fanny Law, Vinicio Lopez, Anna Asebedo,

**Future meetings this semester:** 1 – 3 pm on November 19<sup>th</sup> and December 17<sup>th</sup>

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcomes	Follow up/Individual Responsible
1.	Welcome	New classified and student members welcomed	Geisce/Wynd
2.	Approve 10/15 Minutes	Approved with one minor correction	Geisce/Wynd
3.	Approve Agenda	Approved with names of new members added	Geisce/Wynd
4.	Update and Q & A with VC, Academic & Institutional Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided context info and recap recommendations that the EMC made in 2019-20.</li> <li>• Highlighted instructional budget recommendations made by the EMC for Summer 2020.</li> <li>• Mentioned 2020-21 EMC recommendations and VC Boegel’s response.</li> <li>• Referenced draft <i>Multi-Year Budget and Enrollment Plan (MYBEP)</i> to invite input and recommendations. The hope is that the EMC could add information related to CCSF’s enrollment projections and outlook.</li> <li>• Discussion and Questions for VC Boegel: Are we trying to increase enrollment and completions? Are there other parameters? It is a shared interest to provide enough instructional budget for departments to be able to offer adequate courses for their certificates and degree programs. VC Boegel is hesitant about the EMC making recommendations about specific department’s budgetary needs and encourages guidance on how to frame instructional recommendations.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the criteria used to cut classes? What is the basis to make those hard choices? Several criteria were used to make these decisions. One is that we don't want to give too little FTEF to a department that they simply cannot run their programs. Another is to account for enrollment data and trends. Also need to look at fill rates, number of sections, faculty workload, and growth potential. In some instance, there was not enough allocation for departments to offer additional sections—even if those sections might have a very high fill rate.</li> <li>• It appears that high school enrollment continues to decrease.</li> <li>• Why is NC ESL not recognized in the draft <i>MYBEP</i>? There is a significant number of people who do not speak English. The College needs to support Noncredit ESL and advocate for Career Development College and College Preparation (CDCP) funding. NC enrollment has decreased. The differential funding aspect needs to be addressed. Recognize the need to get more students into NC ESL because it's a feeder to credit, and provide NC ESL students with the skills to gain employment.</li> <li>• Should not the operational costs be less now because of remote instruction? Yes, there's reduction in utility costs. With our return-to-campus plans, the savings will be minimal. We do have large program offerings. The recent work in academic and career community clusters are designed to support students in deciding on programs. Continued modifications/improvements needed on website and CCCApply.</li> <li>• Did CCSF conduct cost analysis to determine how much budget we need to run specific programs based on specific enrollments? So far, the analysis has been focused on instructional budgets. A holistic approach would be to look at that across departments—what each program requires, what enrollment has been and what it is projected to be, number of certificates awarded, how many students graduate in an academic year. Talk about expanding to look at the entire range of expenses (i.e., faculty, chair, classified staff, supplies, and equipment). It is challenging to set priorities especially in a year with limited resources and budget constraints.</li> <li>• VC Boegel is open to receiving recommendations in whatever format the EMC chooses. The draft <i>MYBEP</i> is the first step—like the end of a beginning. There's still work to be done to link enrollment and budget. The challenge is that we have to balance our desire for perfect information with timelines for publishing the schedule. Let's do the best we can together with the time, information and resource we have.</li> </ul>	
5.	Highlight Data Work Group Meetings on 10/20 and 10/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the EMC meeting on 10/1, there was a request regarding section-level enrollment data [like that shared by Edie Kaeuper in spring 2020]. The request was to put section-level enrollment data from Argos into an Excel pivot table to look at programmatic data in more detail.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In early October after the pivot was assembled, it quickly became clear that some complexities needed to be addressed for the pivot table to function appropriately. In particular “families” of courses and lecture/labs often have multiple records for sections that are simultaneously taught. These sections need to be accounted for differently to work appropriately within a pivot mechanism.</li> <li>• A data work group met on 10/20 and 10/27 to review progress and discuss priorities for next steps. There was considerable questioning of any immediate usefulness of having EMC look at data down to this level of detail. The data group agreed that in the near term the pivot data would be most useful to department chairs, which could then inform EMC discussions.</li> <li>• While data such as FTES and FTEF are available in Argos and Tableau, the pivot would give chairs a structure for slicing/interrogating the data all the way down to the record/section level. There are plans to begin sharing this data with departments in the next month.</li> <li>• The data work group also discussed the value of different metrics since enrollment is a multivariate scenario and that there is no single lens we can use to come up with a complete picture.</li> <li>• Along with enrollment data, there is a request to analyze programmatic budget data. Expenditure data were available in prior program reviews but have not recently been analyzed alongside FTES and completions. While budgets for an entire department often span multiple orgs—which needs to be addressed—arguably the more complicated issue is fair attribution of overhead costs. Different approaches could be used.</li> </ul>	
6.	Review Long-Term Enrollment Outlook Data and Discuss Enrollment Outlook, Projections and/or Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about EMC comments and timeline for <i>MYBEP</i> moving forward. The next EMC meeting is 11/19. On 11/12, VC Boegel will present the <i>MYBEP</i> to the Board. EMC asked to contribute to page 14: Credit Outlook, based on the outlook for credit enrollment is as follows; Noncredit Outlook, based on the outlook for noncredit enrollment is as follows.</li> <li>• Members of the committee expressed concerns. With 28 minutes left, Wynd suggested a statement that says the committee does not put forth a recommendation.</li> <li>• Individual members were encouraged to provide feedback to the <i>MYBEP</i>. Information about providing feedback was sent college-wide.</li> </ul> <p><b>MSP:</b> The EMC, standing committee of the PGC, cannot recommend the Multi-Year Budget and Enrollment Plan (MYBE), in its current form, to go forward for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have not had the time nor the information to do a meaningful recommendation.</li> <li>2. This document has no practical significance and says nothing about what we are actually going to do. It is incomplete. It does</li> </ol>	

		<p>not address the concerns of the reductions in light of the ongoing operational necessities of the College.</p> <p>3. The committee just got several new members as of today who could not be asked to vote on a recommendation. Further, the entire committee only started working on this in the last month.</p> <p>Furthermore, the EMC is concerned about the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Auditors, ACCJC, Bond funders, OPEB, and more will see that it is not a plan.</li><li>2. The EMC is concerned that the projected budget recommendations of spending 11% less on classified, 11% less on admin, and 15% less on faculty does not provide information on how our college will be able to operate with these kinds of reductions, especially what a schedule with these reductions would look like.</li></ol> <p>Moved by Wynd; Seconded by Denise; Vote was 8-0-2.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Meeting adjourned at 3:06 pm