



CEMC Meeting Minutes

February 28, 2020 | 10:30 a.m. | Room 1687

Meeting Minutes

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Implement the integration of all ACCJC standards throughout campus structure and processes.
- ❖ Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision-making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities.
- ❖ Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus.

College Enrollment Mgmt. Committee

Members Present (voting):

- Ruth Hanna (voting)
- Thomas Orf (Co-Chair)
- Sarah Thompson (voting)
- Kristina Whalen (Co-Chair)

Members Present (non-voting):

- Dyrell Foster
- LaVaughn Hart (voting today for Chopra)
- Andrea Migliaccio
- Carolyn Scott
- Sui Song

Members Absent:

- Rajeev Chopra (voting)
- Elizabeth David
- William Garcia
- Nan Ho (voting)
- Amy Mattern
- Stuart McElderry (voting)
- Tamica Ward (voting)

Guests:

1. Call to Order

Dr. Orf called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda

Committee approved the agenda (Hanna/Whalen) with the addition of "SCFF proposals info" as item 6A.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes of January 24, 2020

Committee approved minutes (Hanna/Whalen) with one abstention.

4. Latest Numbers

Ms. Hart reporting. Handout provided – enrollment report.

Ms. Hart researched the WSCH/FTEF and discovered a number of classes where hours were not reporting correctly. Ms. Migliaccio explained that the problem stemmed from hour reporting in Banner 8 rolling over to Banner 9. ITS script that runs behind the scene will be adjusted to correct this issue. The clean-up seemed to add about 60 FTES. We are now down two percent largely due to last year's academy being larger.

Fall 2019 as of 2/17/2020

FTES	3,284.87
FTEF	212.97
WSCH/FTEF	474.55
FTES/FTEF	15.42
Fill rate	86.05%
# of Pri Sec	903
	-1.68%

Spring 20 as of 2/24/2020

FTES	3,141.60
FTEF	205.94
WSCH/FTEF	459.87
FTES/FTEF	15.25
Fill rate	78.00%
# of Pri Sec	902
	-1.95%

The committee discussed targets. This is the first year in a while that we won't make our target. Our targets are high for next year; it's the first year of the rolling averages. There is still work being done to create a standard report to reflect our numbers for DEMC. The Chancellor has requested that whenever DEMC comes up with targets, PBC is to review them, and give an analysis on whether or not we can afford it. And if the targets don't match PBC's assessment, it goes back to DEMC.

VP Whalen had a discussion with colleagues from different colleges at a recent conference about how they are dealing with SCFF and enrollment management. Their once simple reports are beginning to break out the populations (special admin, dual enrollment, etc). The conversations are becoming more complex. We need a more robust reporting tool from the District to assist us.

5. Free Tuition Program Discussion

This topic first came up at DEMC. Chabot was looking into some ideals of creating a free tuition program. It was thought at the time that we were the only District in the Bay Area not doing this. More data of what other community colleges are doing was brought in and discussed. Also there was a long discussion on the Faculty Association's e-board about what hasn't worked in the past. But we want to move forward with some type of recommendation of a free tuition program. Chabot now has a proposal, looking at the Promise Grant (handout). From the FA's perspective we would like to move forward with something but would like more information.

There's also been some discussion in our College Council meeting. Some ideas from that meeting: Chabot can move forward with their own program as it does not require us as a district to move forward. But if they have one and we don't, it doesn't look good. The Chancellor's Office has allocated money to each college. Our allocation is significantly higher than Chabot's (\$1.3M vs. \$800K). Both colleges have committed funds to personnel. But we need more data. Currently we've been using the funds by offering College Promise scholarships (\$500/semester to about 700 students based on demonstrated need). If Chabot moves forward with the Promise Program, it's in our best interest to do something similar, making sure we are providing resources to students who need it the most. Whatever decision we make needs to be advertised to make sure students and others are aware.

Questions sent by Rajeev Chopra in his absence:

- *What percentage of students currently follow through with Promise grant? What is projected rate of improvement if they are offered free tuition?*
- *If a student qualifies for the Promise grant, would they pay back the tuition cost?*
- *What is the spill over benefit or additional benefit of Free tuition on SCFF? i.e. 20% success metric?*
- *What is the total cost of Free tuition and what is the (reasonably) projected benefit?*
- *What is the split of money between Chabot and LPC for promise grant recipients? How will free affect FTES?*
- *What are long term effects of this approach?*

The committee discussed and found that more data is needed to answer most of these questions.

Dr. Foster will contact Rajinder Samra and Andi Schreibman to collaborate and get more information.

The committee also discussed the “LPC Student Characteristics Fall 2019 Final Census” report from Rajinder Samra. It was noted that the data does not include those with BOG waivers.

6. Enrollment Implications – Compressed Calendar

There was a request from the DEMC meeting that we discuss this item. It was stated that Vice Chancellor Theresa Rowland is forming an exploratory committee to discuss this issue. We might see a small bump in FTES. This is not a cost-free endeavor. More data is needed. The bump might “help” in the 3-year average. Chabot did bring forth some data last time but it only concerned headcount. We need to look at multiple measures and have more conversations. We have many other issues to review (i.e. space). It would be good to bring this topic up at a Town Meeting where we can get more feedback.

6a. SCFF Proposals Info

VP Whalen discussed updates to SCFF projects for the STEM tool. Bill Komanetsky is working on this. We have reached out to Chabot and they would like to submit it as a joint project. There’s been discussion of whether the District should pay for it instead of SCFF. Chabot had a presentation at their CEMC. The proposal is to explore our options for putting in place a scheduling tool that would allow us to analyze the schedule between drafts. If successful, we would recommend it to the district-wide technology committee for adoption. Chabot wants us to shorten the time frame to a semester so we can implement in the first year. The group consists of coordinators, end users, schedulers. There was a suggestion that folks from the disciplines (those who implement) be included in the group so a semester might not be long enough.

7. Marketing Issues

Dr. Orf will coordinate with the marketing folks to get them on the schedule. VP Whalen shared that in April there will be several events promoting our CTE programs. There is a big social media campaign going on (February – April) at no cost (FB, IG, LinkedIn).

8. Good of the Order

Dr. Foster: Great conversation and great work!

9. Adjournment: 12:02 p.m.

Next meeting: March 13, 2020 at 10:30 a.m.