

# Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Office of Educational Services & Student Success

## Meeting Notes

District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC)

Friday, November 5, 2021

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

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

### DEMC Membership

#### VOTING

		Present
Tom deWit (F)	CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jeff Drouin (F)	CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tom Orf (F)	LPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sarah Thompson (F)	LPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Susan Sperling (A)	CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dyrell Foster (A)	LPC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Theresa Fleischer Rowland (A)	DIST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jonah Nicholas (A)	DIST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### NON-VOTING

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

Additional Meeting Attendees: Angela Castellanos, Billy Delos Santos Jr., Bobby Nakamoto, Chasity Whiteside, Cynthia G. da Cruz, Craig Kutil, Dave Fouquet, Dawn Neideffer, Heather Hernandez, Heike Gecox, Jeanne Wilson, Jennifer Aries, Jennifer Lange, Kirti Ready, Lara Weideman, Matt Kritscher, Nathaniel Rice, Noell Adams, Paulette Lino, Patricia Shannon, Rajinder Samra, Ronald Gerhard, Estella Sanchez, 510-350-6852.

### Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Review
2. Approve Notes from September 3, 2021 and October 1, 2021 DEMC Meetings
3. Tri-Chairs Discussion and Vote
4. Enrollment Updates
  - a. Chabot College
  - b. Las Positas College
5. Walk through the 2022-23 Target Worksheet
6. FTEF/FTES Enrollment Target Discussion
7. Other/Next Meeting

The Friday, November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021 District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) meeting was opened by Theresa Fleischer Rowland.

1. **Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Review**

Theresa welcomed everyone to the DEMC meeting while sharing and briefly describing the meeting agenda with the attendees.

2. **Approve Notes from September 3, 2021 and October 1, 2021 DEMC Meetings**

Estella Sanchez, meeting recorder, took role for the voting members and moved to the approval of the September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021 meeting notes. Jonah Nicholas made the motion to approve, seconded by Theresa Pedrosa. Estella then called for the approval of the October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 meeting notes. Thomas Orf made the motion to approve, seconded by Theresa Pedrosa.

3. **Tri-Chairs Discussion and Vote**

Theresa moved to the next item on the agenda which was proposed by Thomas Orf during the October, 1<sup>st</sup> 2021 DEMC meeting. Theresa shared that the members have had some discussion between meetings and referenced Article 26 for guidance, but the agreement did not outline the chair structure for DEMC. Theresa then asked Thomas to share his motion request again and review what action he would like to see taken by the committee.

Thomas requested to see a Tri-Chair model put into place with equal representation from Chabot College, Las Positas College, and the District Office.

Theresa then reminded the group that she would not be a part of the rotating representation, as the administrative lead from the District Office her seat would remain permanently.

Theresa, after talking with Thomas and Jeff, agreed that now would be a good time to implement the tri-chair model for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 2022. Theresa noted that the FA does have Article 26 coming up in collective bargaining negotiations and once complete there may be more of an outline for DEMC chair structure.

Jeff Drouin shared his agreeance with the statements made by Theresa and noted that this new structure or any other changes could be memorialized during the upcoming negotiation process.

No further comments were made so Theresa asked Estella to take a vote from the voting members.

Tom deWitt Yes

Jeff Drouin Yes

Sarah Thompson Yes

Susan Sperling Yes

Dyrell Foster Yes

Theresa Fleischer Rowland Yes

Jonah Nicholas Yes

Motion passed.

4. **Enrollment Updates**

- a. Chabot College enrollment management report: Jeff shared the current DEMC Dashboard for fall noting that Chabot College was currently down by 11%.

- b. Las Positas enrollment management report: Thomas said that Las Positas is also down, the spreadsheet showed a deficit of slightly more than 10% and he did not see that number changing much anytime soon.  
Theresa thanked Liam and Estella for providing everyone with a copy of the current improved dashboard every Monday, and reminded the group that further improvement recommendations to the model are always welcome.

5. **Walk through the 2022-23 Target Worksheet**

Theresa then moved to the next agenda item and shared the [CLPCCD FTES and FTEF Target Worksheet \(2022-23\)](#) with the group. Theresa pointed out a few updates to the worksheet made by Jonah including the tables at the bottom. These tables document the costs relating to the part-time faculty while linking the FTEF target formulas used to create those targets. Dale and Annette helped to configure the 'Estimated Part Time Faculty Cost' of \$34,950. Theresa thanked Jonah for improving the spreadsheet which in turn allowed everyone access to another data point and tool for use in working with the budget and FTEF targets.

Theresa then shared the last tab of the spreadsheet titled [College Tables](#), this gave the historical data around where the overruns have been regarding part-time faculty at the campuses. It provided the amount budgeted and the amount of FTEF spent each year.

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

While continuing to share the CLPCCD FTES and FTEF Target Worksheet (2022-23), Jeff moved to the next discussion topic. The enrollment target numbers inputted into the worksheet came from each colleges CEMC meeting. The FTES target listed for Chabot College was 9300 and 6746 for Las Positas College. Jeff said that during the Chabot College CEMC meeting they agreed to a target of 430 FTES as their starting point. Jeff asked for comments from other members who attended Chabot's CEMC meeting.

Jamal shared some of the topics they discussed like allocations, productivity numbers, events or issues that transpired during the fall, and also what possibilities may come this spring. The 430 FTES number agreed upon was slightly less than last year's target, but it was a good compromise between the numbers that were discussed which ranged from 410 - 440.

Jeff then asked for comments from Las Positas College regarding their CEMC meeting and target discussion.

Thomas explained that in their process they decided to leave the productivity number at 490 and then they looked at cutting down the target by either 3% or 6%. Ultimately they decided that a 3% cut would be more realistic and if they were to cut the productivity number it would upset the budget.

Kristina Whalen detailed the effectiveness of the new table and how it allowed them to see how increasing the FTEF can balloon the part-time instructional cost and how lowering the productivity increased the FTEF.

Sarah Thompson asked if anyone could explain the logic, besides budget control, how keeping an unrealistic productivity number, which in turn would make the target numbers also unrealistic, makes any sense.

Jeff thought that the next step would be to let the District answer that very question.

Jonah asked Theresa to share on her screen again, the tab titled College Tables and then he reviewed the top table which was for Chabot College. Jonah noted that based on the

assumptions that were fed into the \$11.4 million dollar adjunct budget needed for 2022-23, it was clear that the FTES were probably overstated, the productivity was probably overstated, and that even though the budget states \$11.4 million, Chabot College will probably end up spending \$14 million. Jonah agreed that the assumptions are not necessarily in line with what is actually happening, but that hopefully it would still allow room for discussions.

Sarah thanked Jonah for explaining and making the thought process more understandable.

She then asked if the target number or the productivity number were more important, and if the colleges should be acting in concert or individually.

Jonah felt that the productivity level was more important to look at and gave an example that if they were to cut the productivity number down from 490 to 430 that would in turn lead to a 12% increase right off the top in terms of full-time instructional faculty. Jonah also explained how in terms of budgeting, some adjustments can be made from the back end. In conclusion, he recommended leaving the 490 productivity number alone and felt that 430 was very low.

Jeff asked what the value of the productivity level would be if everyone was in agreement that it was an unattainable number and not very productive, was its only value that it helped calculate the FTEF.

Jonah explained how he has always been an advocate for scheduling classes in order to achieve the overall productivity target the district needs. Regardless of the full-time equivalent faculty that it generated, particularly in a hold harmless district. Speaking from the financial side, not from a student services stand point, Jonah said that there were no incremental dollars generated on an apportionment basis when increasing the FTES. Jonah further clarified how dollars that fall to the bottom line could be seen by increasing productivity via scheduling fewer classes, this can oftentimes create a 10% decrease in classes. Jonah understood that this line of thinking was slightly different than this committee has done in previous years, but he believed the focus should be on hitting a higher productivity target.

Dave Fouquet respectfully disagreed with Jonah and shared that while he could see this line of thinking work in normal circumstances, right now the current climate is too far off from 'normal'. Dave believed that students are still going to be reluctant to return to face-to-face classes for the next few semesters. If the group agrees that this new reluctance is going to be more of a permanent situation, then he agreed it would make sense to push for a higher productivity number. But, if the goal is to restore classes, be available for the students, and create a vibrant on campus climate, then the next few semesters should allow the smaller classes to run. Cancelling in-person classes that have students enrolled will only drive students back to taking more online classes or another institution.

Patricia Shannon shared her appreciation for Dave's comments and also wanted to address the historical problem, particularly relating to equity. Patricia believed showing caution when discussing this number was of high importance as well as the need to address the increase of lab load factors over the past 15 years. This increase was heavily related to the demand from the state and from students that they complete courses successfully and the best way to achieve that is through face time. Higher productivity numbers cannot truly be achieved because every time the class size is reduced or the number of students in the classroom increases, the actual cost of the class will go up. Patricia felt that the state was sending a tremendously mixed message by asking the district to focus on higher productivity. To be equitable these two goals are almost mutually exclusive, and it is a set up for failure.

Tom referenced Sarah's comments from earlier and shared his preference that the colleges be in concert with the productivity target. He believed the productivity number should be set to 460 since both colleges performed at 459 last year. With the district being on hold harmless he felt that there should be enough money to fund the schedule properly. Tom added that with a productivity number of 490 another round of part time faculty would be laid off. He also noted that the FTES target reductions were slightly different between the 2 colleges and he recommended reconciling that.

David Rodriguez shared a personal experience he was going through with trying to help a friend enroll into another college and the long process of dealing with financial aid and scheduling. He wanted to respectfully encourage and remind the group how support for the students and community is greatly needed and how the decisions made here should take into consideration the well-being of the institution as a whole.

Miguel Colon stressed the need to recapture students and create a realistic target number. He suggested starting at 410 since it is an attainable number then work on capturing those students. He did not want to see the district cancelling more classes and turning away more students who may end up leaving and attending another college all together.

Jonah addressed Tom's statements regarding laying off more part-time faculty and understood that while it is not an ideal situation, most likely it will happen because the demand is down. Jonah added that just because there are full-time equivalent faculty on the schedule, running a class with only 4 or 5 students is not a good use of resources. Jonah called for some level of balance between the reality of the student demand being down, and what that would mean for the adjunct side of the equation.

Tom felt that a target of 460 and a 3 year incremental approach would be the balance needed. Sarah shared her gratitude for everyone's comments and appreciated the clarification given by everyone.

Theresa also shared her appreciation for the collegial group conversations had today and shared her understanding of the additional hurdles students will face with the upcoming vaccination process. There have been many conversations had at the district and with the college presidents and the unknown that lies ahead with spring will be hard to predict. Theresa agreed that turning away students would not be ideal and keeping classes open should be a high priority.

Jonah asked if there had been any tweaking to the schedule regarding moving 3 day 1 hour classes to 2 day 1.5 hour classes in order to squeeze out more contact hours and in return more FTES.

Kristina Whalen stated that they have not done that type of analysis at Las Positas and she was unsure if they had the software to so.

Jamal agreed that Jonah's idea would be a good strategy to look into, and that Chabot College has not done anything like that during that last 5+ years.

Jonah offered to help run the analysis needed and would be available to talk more about that offline.

Patricia agreed that looking at this new analysis would be help but she also wanted to point out the "creep factor" of additional units and factors. It could help bracket the types of true productivity increases.

Nathaniel Rice shared his thoughts on focusing on the interpersonal relationships and the building back of the community. Making sure the focus is on the students who are people

with personal and academic goals. He felt that building back the community relationships will lead to increased enrollments naturally.

Theresa shared the worksheet on her screen again and offered to make real time adjustments to see how the numbers change. She first changed the target from 490 to 460. This caused the FTES to remain the same but the FTEF jumped from 604 to 640 which caused some concerns in the group.

Sarah asked how repeating the same patterns for the last few years and expecting a different outcome made sense.

Dave mentioned the area between 460 and 490 as a place to consider and also stated that while he did not prefer to lecture smaller classes, it is important to recapture enrollments. He also reiterated what Tom said and shared his concern for letting go of more part-time faculty. Thomas suggested changing the 460 to 465 on the worksheet, which ended up getting the numbers closer to the numbers from last year.

Theresa explained how the enrollment numbers since 2019/2020 are down 20% and if they were to decrease this year's target number by that same 20% the number would actually be 528 for Chabot College. Therefore with a target of 490 it shows how the district is keeping FTEF on the schedule.

Sarah circled back to her comment from earlier regarding priorities. She felt as though the priority number would be the FTES number since that is what is looked at first when discussing the FTEF. She shared her confusion for the numbers and how they align even though she understood the math behind them and how they help to keep the budget on track. Jonah added another data point; the 2022-2023 FTES 'aspirational' target of 16,046 being proposed included 500 more full-time students than were reported last year. Jonah addressed Sarah comments and added that this number is definitely overstated from what the district will achieve.

Dave shared that at Chabot College there are quite a number of programs with low enrollments and that they are trying to preserve the full-time faculty load for those. Dave recalled when they were encouraged to cut the schedule for spring of 2022 the Deans realized they were not able to cut much without actually cutting class. Classes that may have filled up had they been given more time. Dave worried that setting the main group number at a level that would reduce the FTEF may result in a similar scenario. Although the district has said that FTEF can be added later, Dave felt nervous with that plan since the dynamic of it has not been seen yet. The main concern he shared was the need to keep students and not turn them away by cancelling classes.

Jonah recalled the agreement made to not cut classes that had at least 15 students enrolled, therefore productive classes should not have been cut.

Tom explained that the agreement was made for fall, and Dave was referring to spring. Tom said that Chabot is feeling cornered with nowhere to turn and has really no room left to cut.

Theresa called for a vote for the productivity number of 490:

Tom deWitt Yes FTES No Productivity

Jeff Drouin Yes FTES No Productivity

Sarah Thompson No

Thomas Orf No

Susan Sperling Yes FTES No Productivity

Dyrell Foster No

Theresa Fleischer Rowland Yes

Jonah Nicholas Yes

Theresa thanked everyone for their contributions and concluded the meeting due to time restriction.

7. **Other/Next Meeting**

Estella to email the voting group members and schedule a follow up meeting for later this month. The follow up meeting will decide on the final recommendation due to the Chancellor by the end of November per Article 26.