<div align="center">

District Enrollment Management Committee

April 4, 2014
1:00pm – 3:00pm
District Office/Spruce
Street
Room 319

<u>Meeting Minutes</u>

</div>

<u>**Members present:**</u>
Moreno Valley College Members: Chris Whiteside, Dean of Instruction, Career & Tech
Ed; Chris Nollette, Associate Professor EMS, Moreno Valley; Chris Rocco, Associate
Professor, Humanities
Norco College Members: Diane Dieckmeyer, Vice President, Academic Affairs; Melissa Bader, Associate
Professor, English
Riverside City College Members: Susan Mills, Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs; Richard Mahon,
Professor, Humanities; Lee Nelson, Associate Professor, Nursing & President, RCC and RCCD Academic
Senate
District Members: Robin Steinback, Interim Vice Chancellor of Educational Services Workforce Development
and Planning, Raj Bajaj, Dean, Institutional Reporting and Educational Services; Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor,
Business & Financial Services; Chris Carlson, Chief of Staff and Facilities Development
Guests: Carol Farrar, Dean of Instruction (Norco College) David Vakil, Dean of Instruction (Moreno Valley
College); Kevin Fleming, Dean of Instruction CTE (Norco); Beth Gomez, VP Business Services (Norco)

- **Welcome & Introductions**: Robin Steinback called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

The group's recommendations of channeling the reporting pathway through the Strategic Planning
Committee were presented to Executive Cabinet on March 24th. The feedback from the executive
cabinet was very positive that we now have a clearer pathway of reporting to the District Strategic
Planning Committee.

- **Minutes:** The meeting notes from March 21st were approved as amended with the correction that
Patricia Avila name being corrected. Motion: The committee agreed to include the VP of business
services from each college.

Voting rights from the members will need further discussions.
Dr. Dieckmeyer approved the minutes.

- **Strategic Planning Enrollment Management Goals (Goal 14)**: Recommended measures to meet the
goals of refining enrollment management and curriculum delivery were discussed. It was clarified that
the committee task is to allocate FTES to the colleges and abstain from management of course offerings
within the colleges. The district is to provide support for the colleges in terms of curriculum delivery,
best practices and suggestions. The disciplines discuss and manage course offerings between colleges.
One way to measure would be to define possible outcomes and evaluate how to meet these outcomes.

- **Developing Criteria/Metrics for Enrollment Management & FTES Allocations**

 Discussions:
We have shared information from Peralta, Ventura, Contra Costa and State Center. FTES allocations are tied to Enrollment Management, Budget allocations models and resource allocations for each college. These models can be reviewed for best practices. We should also review models from San Diego, Coast, Kern and Los Rios districts.
The group discussed the type of questions or information we should be reviewing.
Our colleagues are involved in State wide organizations like region 9, academic senates and CIO groups across the State. Qualitative evaluation needs to be done for meeting demands, the course offerings must be made in an efficient way at the College level. We should be monitoring fill rates early in the registration period and review information on student populations. High school graduation rates play a critical role in facilitating the management of courses at the college level. We should also be reviewing performance based funding. Day/Evening classes fill rates vary by discipline and college. Also we need to review the distribution of courses in Basic skills, Transfer and Workforce prep. Student Education plans and student success initiative may provide us with leads to developing the Matrix.
For planning purposes we need to have a Base for FTES allocations and a model for unfunded FTES. Colleges will need to be incentivized for growth. It is difficult to define the base at this point. In addition to Base funding colleges we will need to have a provision for special programs. DBAC plays an important role in allocation of resources. We need to focus on matrix for developing the FTES allocation. Concept of base FTES needs to be evaluated further.
The committee would recommend that each college will have a base. Separate model can be used for distribution of growth and or unfunded FTES. Criteria will still need to be developed to define the real base. Discussions implied that the base should be defined based on historical FTES distribution. Base will shift over time based on the demographics and demand from specific service areas. FON and 50 % law may be taken into consideration while developing the model and the base. How do we shift resources to college? Currently we have an imbalance between funding and FTES generation. Historical budget allocations were shared by Business office to indicate that we are out of balance at this point with Cost/FTES varies between colleges. As we get closer to entity alignment each of the college, will need to manage the offerings based on productivity measures at 525. We are all aware of the limitations on some of the courses based on student/faculty ratio.

Follow-up Actions: We need to come with a matrix to develop the base FTES keeping in mind that the base can shift in the future.
Attachment: Budget Allocation discussed by Aaron.

- **Date and Agenda Topics for Next Meeting**

Acquire more models, discuss with our peers and review information for further discussions.

- The Next Meeting is scheduled for May 14th, 10-12 noon.

Meeting adjourned 2:58pm