FACULTY GUIDE TO ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT AT LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

Spring 2003

Las Positas College Enrollment Management Committee

CONTENTS

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES:

> To help faculty and administrators develop discipline plans to maximize student access, success, and equity through balanced and cost-effective resource utilization that will advance the teaching and learning function of the college.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

This packet initiates the first round of an annual enrollment management process that will see faculty members in our district take a more active part in making decisions about course offerings that best utilize the financial, human, and physical resources of the college. Some people hear the term enrollment management and automatically assume that it means cramming more students into every classroom. This is not the case. Turning sections of 45 students into sections of 55 students without adequate seating in the classrooms, and at the cost of student success and teaching effectiveness, may be a kind of enrollment management, but it's a lousy kind. Good enrollment management involves making informed decisions about when, where, and how many classes are scheduled; which ones should be offered given student needs, goals, and outcomes; and which course offerings and formats enhance the college's primary function and best utilize existing resources. This kind of enrollment management requires analyzing quantitative data and qualitative assessments. Yes, class size is an important part of this process. But it is by no means the only part.

Enrollment management begins at the district level.[1] As part of its annual budget development process, the District will consult with the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) to establish FTEF allocations and set WSCH/FTEF goals. From there, the College Enrollment Management Committees (CEMC) at LPC and Chabot will consult with each discipline and study past enrollment data to develop discipline-based recommendations for FTEF allocations and WSCH/FTEF goals.[2] Once the CEMC has made its recommendations, it is up to the faculty--in consultation and collaboration with the division deans and with the CEMC--to develop discipline plans that utilize the allocated FTEF in ways that will meet or exceed college WSCH/FTEF targets, and that will ensure student access, equity, and success. When complete, these

---

[1]For a complete description of this process, see: Agreement between Chabot-Las Positas Community College District and Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association, July 2, 2002 - June 30, 2005, Article 29. This can be found on the district's EM website along with other useful information, including a position paper on enrollment management by the State Academic Senate.

[2]Agreement, 29E-E.1.

plans are submitted to the responsible Vice President in time to allow for revisions and scheduling.

Eventually, every member of the faculty will become an enrollment management expert. The enrollment management software developed by the District's IT staff is user-friendly and the concepts and issues that guide enrollment management are relatively simple. All it takes is time and effort. Effort we have; time we don't. In order to launch enrollment management to help deal with the budget crisis, the LPC CEMC has asked a self-selected corps of faculty to serve as Enrollment Management Facilitators (EMFs). EMFs are faculty from each of the major discipline clusters who have volunteered to be trained on the EM tool and the basic concepts and strategies of the enrollment management process. The EMF's role is to work in consultation and collaboration with the CEMC and the division deans to help the faculty become familiar with enrollment management and to make informed decisions concerning course offerings for the 2003-2004 academic year. For a list of EMFs, see page 15. As we progress, the CEMC will schedule training sessions for any interested faculty. If you would like to be trained, please contact Stuart McElderry (x5898).

DISCIPLINE PLANS FOR 2003 - 2004 ACADEMIC YEAR

Immediate Objective

For the immediate future, enrollment management is going to be about making carefully-considered reductions in course offerings as a means to address the current budget crisis. In December, the DEMC established a target of 190 sections (19 FTEF) that LPC must reduce from its course offerings between spring 2003 and spring 2004. To help meet this target, the DEMC also asked LPC to reduce summer term by approximately 50 percent (or roughly 80 sections). Through especially prudent administrative cancellations (cutting courses that did not meet the minimum enrollments) this semester, we have already made 42 of these cuts.[3]

Our first task is to plan for summer term 2003. The CEMC has elected not to ask the disciplines to develop full-fledged discipline plans for summer. Rather, faculty members should simply meet with their discipline colleagues and their dean to round out a summer schedule that helps the college meet a target of approximately 50 percent fewer 3-unit equivalent sections. Courses with relatively low fill rates last summer, those that enrolled high percentages of high school students, and courses that do not primarily serve our core mission and

---

[3]As of January 31 the total number of class cancellations for spring 2003 was 64. However, we must subtract the number of sections canceled last spring (22) from this figure to count toward our DEMC-determined target of 190 by spring 2004.

student population are the kinds of courses that should be kept off of the summer 2003 schedule. Summer schedules must be completed no later than February 12.

Our second task, to be launched simultaneously with summer planning, is to develop draft discipline plans for the remainder of the 2003-2004 academic year. The CEMC has not set specific discipline targets for fall and spring reductions. Generally speaking, if we figure that we've already cut 42 sections from spring 2003, and if we come close to 80 sections from summer, we'll need to cut roughly 34 sections each from fall 2003 and spring 2004. For the month of February, we need to develop plans for fall 2003. We will turn our attention to spring 2004 later. The easiest approach is to make the changes discussed in the fall scheduling meetings and then to consider eliminating any additional courses that seem appropriate: those with historically low enrollments or poor marks in terms of student access, success, and equity. Discipline plans will include a list of changes to be made in course offerings--courses cut, added, or changed from previous schedules--a rationale for these changes that addresses how the changes affect productivity, access, success, and equity. Past enrollment data (including fill rates, WSCH/FTEF, student success), and projected changes, based on the new enrollment management reporting tool, should also be included in these plans. Faculty shall develop discipline plans in consultation with division deans, EMFs, the CEMC, and others--such as the Institutional Researcher, who should be consulted for suggestions and information. Draft discipline plans, addressing only the fall 2003 schedule, are to be submitted to division deans by February 20 so that the CEMC can discuss them at its February 21 meeting. While the spring 2004 schedule will not be part of the initial draft plan, projected spring course offerings should at least be considered in this stage of the process. Disciplines will continue to revise their 2003-2004 plans, and set spring 2004 schedules, in March and April. For additional guidance, see the sample draft discipline plan on page 15.

Timeline

February 5:   EM planning packets distributed to all full-time faculty and administrators. Packets will be available to adjunct faculty upon request.

Faculty, in consultation with deans, EMFs, and the CEMC begin to develop summer schedules and draft discipline plans for academic year 2003-2004, focusing for the time being on fall 2003.

February 12:   Last day for deans to submit summer 2003 schedules.

February 21:   Deans submit draft discipline plans, with fall 2003 schedules only, to CEMC.

February 28: CEMC examines draft discipline plans and fall 2003 schedule, recommends revisions as necessary.

March 3: First draft of summer and fall 2003 schedule

Criteria used to Develop Discipline Plans

By February 20, each discipline must submit to its division dean a draft discipline plan that addresses summer and fall 2003 course offerings and how these offerings address the following criteria: productivity, access, equity, and success.

Economic Productivity

The faculty contract establishes the new enrollment management process as a means to improve the district's cost-effectiveness defined as a balance between economic and academic productivity. Productivity in an economic sense refers to generating and efficiently utilizing all funding resources. It is important that everyone involved in enrollment management have a basic understanding of how the district is funded and how their classes fit into this process.

The state allocates to our district approximately $3,400 for every FTES (Full Time Equivalent Student) up to a particular limit ("cap"). Any FTES above the annual growth cap are un-funded growth. The state uses demographic trends to allocate FTES funds. If a district's enrollments (and projected enrollments) are dropping, the state will reduce the funding base; if they're growing, the state will increase the base up to cap. Most colleges try to achieve a slight amount of un-funded growth each year. This un-funded growth not only ensures that the college won't fall below its projected number of FTES, but it also makes the college eligible for growth monies. The need to meet a projected number of FTES and to be eligible for growth funds is one reason why, even in the midst of the budget shortfall, we need to avoid cutting too many sections and risk dropping below our 2003-2004 FTES target. There is a strange logic here. The state is cutting our funds and forcing cuts. At the same time, it expects and encourages us to meet our growth numbers for this year. This is the difficult task, then, facing enrollment management: to make the college more cost-efficient, by reducing FTEF (eliminating sections), while maintaining our projected growth in FTES.

How is an FTES determined? The state counts every 525 hours of student attendance as one FTES. Why 525? Because a student taking 3 hours of classes per day for 175 days (the required number of instructional days) would have attended 525 hours of class for an academic year. The number

of student hours is therefore a vital statistic for a community college. For funding purposes, we keep track of WSCH (weekly student contact hours) as a means to determine how many FTES a particular course, section, or discipline generates. Let's say a section of Anthropology 1 enrolls 40 students and meets 3 hours per week. This section generates 120 WSCH (3 hours/week x 40 students). To determine how much money this section generates for the district, we multiply 120 (WSCH) by 17.5 (number of weeks in the semester) and divide by 525 (the total number of hours in a year for one full-time student) and we get 4 FTES (120 x 17.5 ÷ 525 = 4). The Anthropology section's 4 FTES, then, generate approximately $13,600 in state funds.

If this is the income, what are the costs? The most significant cost (outside of facilities, support staff, materials, etc.) is recorded as FTEF (Full Time Equivalent Faculty). In our Anthropology example, the FTEF is .2 (faculty workload) since it would require five 3-hour/week sections to equal a full 15-hour/week teaching load (5 courses x .2 FTEF = 1 FTEF). To determine the cost-effectiveness per FTEF, we use the ratio WSCH/FTEF. If our hypothetical Anthropology instructor teaches five courses with an average enrollment of 40 students, that instructor's WSCH/FTEF figure would be 600 (120 student contact hours per week multiplied by 5 sections).

At this point it is vital that we are clear that each discipline is different in terms of how much WSCH it can, and indeed should, generate. A comprehensive community college must include programs with smaller enrollments than others. This is as it should be. It would be short-sighted and foolish to think that every subject should have as many students as can fit into the room in order to generate as much income as possible. While 40 students may be an appropriate size for a lecture-based Anthropology class, it would be inappropriate for a chemistry lab or for an English composition class. In order for LPC to serve its students, and to meet its core mission to provide a comprehensive general education and vocational curriculum, the disciplines must support each other. One discipline may generate 600 WSCH/FTEF while another generates 350. The college as a whole aims for 525 whereby it achieves balance: one FTES for one FTEF. Therefore, the purpose of understanding and examining these numbers is not to compare and contrast the different disciplines. Rather, it is to enable each discipline to evaluate itself according to its own, discipline-specific standards. If a discipline has slipped recently in WSCH/FTEF, the faculty in that discipline needs to figure out why and whether or not to develop some new scheduling strategies or make other changes.

Besides helping each discipline run more efficiently, understanding how the college makes money can empower faculty to innovate in terms of how and what they teach. For example, if our hypothetical Anthropology

instructor, whose sections generate an average annual WSCH/FTEF of 600 wanted to teach a special seminar for prospective majors and wanted to limit enrollment to 10 or 15 students, she could offset this smaller WSCH-producing course by slightly increasing the enrollments of her large lecture courses. Or perhaps an Economics instructor, who teaches five classes of 45 students per semester, wanted to assign more written work in one of his courses but was reluctant to be buried under so much grading. This instructor might want to increase enrollments in his sections in order to generate additional funding. With this "money," he could develop an internship program with Cal State Hayward to hire a graduate student as a part-time reader for this course. This would allow the Economics instructor to improve his course simply by utilizing the enrollment management process to allocate FTEF in ways he saw fit. In both the Anthropology and Economics example, there would be no requests from the college for money. Rather, each instructor generated his/her own funds by shifting existing resources within the discipline.

In the planning process, each discipline should evaluate past and current enrollment data and answer the following questions:

- Which courses/sections have the highest and the lowest fill rates?

- What factors may account for these patterns? Time of day? Day of the week?

- Why would students take the course? Does it satisfy requirements or basic skills needs?

- Why might students avoid this class? Are they aware of the class?

- Does the course conflict/compete with other courses for the same pool of students?

Academic Productivity

Productivity in an academic sense involves student access, equity, and success.

Access

In a general sense, the enrollment management decisions made by the college must correspond to the purpose and mission of California's community colleges to provide open access to all individuals seeking to improve themselves and to reach their potential through education and

training. It will be up to Academic and Student Services to work together to develop ways to encourage and enable students to achieve their educational goals at LPC. In developing discipline plans, faculty members need to consider whether their course offerings:

- Serve students at night and day.

- Serve students on Friday and Saturday, where possible.

- Maintain consistency of offerings across terms to enable students to complete sequences.

- Balance entry-level offerings, focusing on providing multiple entry points, with later courses in a sequence.

- Minimize conflicts with other disciplines that share the same pool of students.

- Balance basic skills offerings with transfer or AA/AS offerings based on student demand.

- Ensure that prerequisites are in place and valid or are removed when not needed.

- Offer online/distance education formats.

- Correspond to what is outlined in the college catalogue in terms of degree/certificate requirements.

- Maximize student access given WSCH/FTEF targets.

Equity

Equity is success and access represented demographically. As a community college, our mission is to serve all of our community equally in terms of providing access and promoting success. For the time being, our demographic breakdowns include only age, gender, and ethnicity. Eventually, however, the CEMC would like to provide faculty with additional categories, such as: feeder high school, socio-economic status, educational status (probationary or returning student, for example), educational goal, financial aid, and probationary- or returning-student status.

Success

In a basic way, success is determined by grade (A-C and CR) and withdrawal data. This is a commonly-used measure to evaluate success. But success (and failure) is not always reflected in course grades. Some faculty (and indeed many students) may take issue with considering a "C" to be evidence of success. Conversely, depending on a student's background, abilities, and circumstances, and depending on the course, a "C" grade can be considered great success. Beyond grades we may want to examine the degree to which a course contributes, or fails to contribute, to a more general life enrichment or student growth. In developing discipline plans, faculty members need to consider whether their courses:

- Achieve a satisfactory level of passing grades.

- Achieve success by encouraging the development of basic skills (such as critical thinking, expression, problem solving).

- Achieve success by improving student knowledge of the field of study, or generate student interest in taking additional courses in the field.

When we examine success, we should also consider some of the ways in which courses simply don't work. For example, does a course even with decent student grades fail to maximize student success because it:

- Fails to engage students in a meaningful way?

- Meets too early or late in the day for students to perform up to their abilities?

- Experiences higher-than-normal withdrawal rates?

- Is the discipline or format appropriate to a class of this length/time of day/length of term?

Besides grades and these other kinds of questions, we'll eventually develop more complex methods of evaluating student success. By the next round of accreditation, for example, LPC will develop multiple measures of student learning outcomes apart from course grades. As these new measures are developed, they will become part of the success data used in making enrollment management decisions.

Scheduling Strategies

The following scheduling strategies may be helpful for a discipline considering ways to increase productivity and to improve student access, equity, and success. Examples of each of these strategies will be posted to the EM website by February 10.

- Shadow Sections - This is a practice used at several community colleges where faculty create ½ to 1 unit support courses that supplement the primary course offerings, usually a TBA. The idea is to identify a distinct skill, activity, or support and separate it out in the form of a concurrent offering. This can also be done with many kinds of instructional support services. Perhaps something that can be learned on a computer, in a lab, a center, the library, the Internet. Perhaps something that can be facilitated by tutors, instructional assistants, teaching assistants, or self-paced mastery learning materials. Channeling a lot of students through such an offering can generate WSCH and take pressure off the primary courses

- Cross Listing - This is a practice of cross-listing more than one section to optimize facility usage and allowable enrollments, such as courses with different lecture times but combined labs, or different levels of studio classes taught by one instructor in one space.

- Alternative Scheduling Patterns - This strategy would look at how well scheduling has worked in the past and determine how new scheduling patterns - day/night, alternating semesters, pairing courses, etc. - could help enrollment.

- Allowed Enrollment - This would allow faculty to take extra enrollment in high demand courses, so as to support low enrollment classes, without setting any precedent for future allowed enrollment. (Note: all class size maximums and minimums are now subject to negotiations.)

- Ghost Sections - This practice would aim at increasing flexibility and student access by identifying high demand sections, watching their enrollment closely, and when a section fills, immediately double the allowed enrollment while having a pool of faculty and predetermined available rooms so we can open an extra section.

- Scale Back Historically Low-Enrolled Sections - This practice would, after looking at past enrollment trends, offer fewer sections in a course that has multiple-section offerings in order to free up hours for historically high demand sections.

- Review Prerequisites- So as to ensure that students have proper access to our courses, we should look at our prerequisites to make sure that they are current and being enforced. Currently many of our prerequisites are not enforced, yet students don't know that when signing up for classes and it takes working the system to override the prerequisite, which results in unequal access for students. One idea is turning a prerequisite into a co-requisite.

- Large Lecture - The goal here is to improve utilization of our large lecture facilities. Identify what course could be offered in a large lecture format by combining sections. Also articulate what support services would be needed to ensure quality instruction.

- Zero-unit Support Courses - You can actually use a zero unit course, invisible to the instructor and the student, to support your classroom instruction. The rule is that in order to account for student contacts that some instruction must be provided whether it be in the form of materials, equipment, tutors, or faculty supervision. All courses must have an instructor of record. This kind of course could be a practice room or a computer science lab; perhaps a problem set, simulated experiment, or sample essay that an instructor used to support the learning in the classroom. One of the issues here is where to house this and how to track the student flow. These types of courses must clearly support student access, success, and/or equity. It will be the role of the Curriculum Committee to help facilitate this instructional focus.

- Cycles - What are the cycles (sequences) in which you offer your courses? Do you have overlapping cycles, hence more frequent entry points for students? Can you break up your cycle, to provide wider or more frequent entry points: greater access? Sometimes, students get stuck at a place in a sequence, particularly at the beginning levels; does your course content, methodology or pedagogy allow you to break big courses into two, or break off pieces of a course and offer it so students have some place to work with the material in the discipline? The notion here is to make the ground floor of your sequence accessible.

- Short term late start classes - Can sometimes use a late start class to provide a place to go for students who withdrew from a class because it was too challenging. Perhaps this late start class could be a scaled-down, narrower class that could help the students be successful at the class from which they withdrew.

- Cohorts - The scheduling process can be used to package classes together so students can come to campus and take a combination of classes. Classes can be grouped together around certain skills, themes,

CSU area requirements, language or numerical work in one course that would support success in another course.

- <u>Initiate Short Term Courses That Can Blend Into the Full Term Course</u> - These might provide opportunities for focused study of or practice with selected content or course skills relevant to a primary course.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Att	Attendance Method code
CEMC	College Enrollment Management Committee
CRN	Course registration number
Crse	Course number
DEMC	District Enrollment Management Committee
EM	Enrollment Management
EMF	Enrollment Management Facilitator
FTEF	Full Time Equivalent Faculty
FTE-FT	FTE value of course taught by full-time faculty
FTE-OL	FTE value of course taught by full-time faculty on overload
FTE-PT	FTE value of course taught by part-time faculty
FTES	Full Time Equivalent Student
WSCH	Weekly Student Contact Hours (resident & non-resident)
Xlis	Cross listed course

CONTACTS

The development of discipline plans is intended to be a collaborative process. Everyone here has an interest in combining student access, success, and equity with a high degree of productivity and resource utilization. Colleagues, Deans, the CEMC, EMFs, and Staff will all be critical resources in helping disciplines make informed and innovative decisions. If you have questions, concerns, or new ideas please express them to as many people as possible. Besides your division dean, the college vice presidents, and President Halliday, the following is a list of people who may help answer questions, explain processes, provide information or listen to your ideas.

Dale Boercker (x5832)　　　Las Positas CEMC member: local EM software expert & EMF: Mathematics

Mary Campbell (x4918)　　　Las Positas CEMC member: EMF: Performing Arts

Greg Daubenmire (x3085)　　EMF: Mathematics

Tom deWit (x6821)　　　　　Chabot CEMC Chair: EM processes & ideas

Lisa Everett (x3084)　　　　EMF: Physical Education and Health

Jackie Fitzgerald (x4935)　　EMF: Early Childhood Development

Leslie Gravino (x5856)　　　EMF: Business, Economic, & Workforce Dev.

Judy Hanson (x5880)　　　　Academic Services Specialist: scheduling

Eric Harpell (x5879)　　　　EMF: Science

LaVaugn Hart (x5894)　　　　EMF: Computer Studies

Joel Kinnamon (x5204)　　　Vice Chancellor and District EM Point Person

Amber Machamer (x5827)　　Institutional Researcher: success and other data

Stuart McElderry (x5898)　　Las Positas CEMC Chair & EMF: Social Science

Sarah Nielsen (x3080)　　　　EMF: English as a Second Language

Mike Sato (x2690)　　　　　EMF: English

Mark Tarte (x2325)　　　　　EMF: Public Sector

Barbara Zingg (x4987)　　　EMF: Science

DRAFT DISCIPLINE PLAN, 2003-2004
History

I. CEMC RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Reduce summer 2003 offerings by half from the summer 2002 schedule.

2. Reduce fall 2003 offerings by 10% (at the division level) from fall 2002 schedule or revisit and make/alter the cuts scheduled in the December scheduling meetings.

II. CHANGES IN COURSES AND/OR COURSE OFFERINGS: Briefly explain how the proposed changes relate to the following criteria. Please attach actual and working data reports to illustrate the planned impact of these changes.

A. SUMMER 2003

1. Eliminate History 7 V01
2. Eliminate History 8 V01
3. Eliminate History 7 DE2
4. Eliminate History 8 DE2

5. Change History 14 V01 to History 7 V01

Net reduction: 4 fewer sections than previous summer = 44% cut (-.8 FTEF).

B. FALL 2003

Primary Cuts:

1. Eliminate History 7 V05 (Friday morning)
2. Eliminate History 14 WE1 (Saturday)

Net effect: 2 fewer sections than fall 2002 (-.6 FTEF)

Secondary Cuts (if necessary):

3. History 8 V01
4. History 2 V01 (offer in spring)

C. SPRING 2004
N/A

III. RATIONALE. Briefly describe below how the proposed course schedule address the following criteria: productivity, access, success, and equity.

Summer 2003: History 7 and 8 V01 were cut when the college elected not to offer either of the 5-week terms. History 7 DE2 and 8 DE2 were selected for cuts not because they experienced unacceptable fill rates, but because of the need to make deep cuts as a college. These sections, which were secondary sections anyway, seemed an obvious choice. To keep the DE2's would mean cutting an on-campus course and thereby closing off access to those students unable or unwilling to enroll in DE courses. History 14 V01 was cut and replaced with History 7 V01 for similar reasons. Students looking to take History 7 would have no choice but the online class without History 7 V01. History 14 already has another on-campus course (093).

Why didn't History eliminate 50 percent of its offerings? History offered 9 courses last year. It's impossible for us to cut 4.5 sections. Rather than cut 5 from summer, we've cut one more than that was planned in the December meeting from Fall. In other words, History made up for the missing half section from Summer by eliminating a full section from Fall.

Fall 2003: Primary cuts amount to two sections (.4 FTEF). These courses show relatively low fill rates and are less crucial for student access and equity than other sections with lower than average fill rates.

**** NO TIME TO INCLUDE RATIONALES FOR ACCESS, SUCCESS, AND EQUITY -- PLEASE INCLUDE THIS IN YOUR DRAFT PLAN.

IV. RESOURCES/MARKETING. Describe below how the college may assist the discipline in making the changes outlined in the discipline plan or for otherwise improving productivity, success, access, and equity.

History 27: American Women is designed to satisfy the American Cultures requirement. Unfortunately, the class was not added as a course that fulfills this requirement for the AA or AS degrees to the General Education Requirements pages of the 2002-2004 LPC Catalogue. This oversight, no doubt, has and will continue to negatively impact the course's fill rate. We need to work with Student Services, particularly the academic counseling staff, to make sure that they are aware of this problem so that they may direct students who may be interested in fulfilling the requirement with this class.

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

None

VII. ATTACHED REPORTS

1. Summer 2002 Actual
2. Fall 2002 Actual
3. Summer 2002 Working (proposed 2003 changes)
4. Fall 2002 Working (proposed 2003 primary cuts)
5. Fall 2002 Working (proposed 2003 primary <u>and</u> secondary cuts)