

District Enrollment Management Committee

April 7, 2015

8 a.m.-10 a.m.

District Office 307

Committee Webpage <http://websites.rccd.edu/enrollmentmanagement/>



Minutes

Membership

| Moreno Valley College | Norco College | Riverside City College | District |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L. Parker, Faculty | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M. Bader, Faculty | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> R. Mahon, Faculty | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M. Reiner, VC Ed. Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> R. Steinback, VPAA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Dieckmeyer, VPAA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Mills, Interim VPAA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. Brown, VC Bus & Fin. Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N. Godin, VPBS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B. Gomez, VPBS | <input type="checkbox"/> M. Brewington, VPBS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C. Carlson, Chief Staff/Facilities |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L. Nelson, Faculty | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> R. Bajaj, Dean Ed Svcs, Inst .Reporting |
| | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Thomas, AVC Ed Services |
| RCCD Academic Senate | RCCD Faculty Association | RCCD Guests | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> T. Gibbs, President | <input type="checkbox"/> C. Rocco | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Torres | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Soto for Gibbs | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> R. Herman | |

Called to order 8:05

1. Welcome & Announcements
2. Approval of April 7, 2015 Agenda - approved
3. Approval of February 4, 2015 Minutes - Motion to Approve MSC/Bader/Parker, 3 abstentions, passed
4. Reports:
 - a. District FTES target for 2015-16 set at 28,465.64. Reported to the DSPC & Chancellor. DEMC recommended dividing total FTES among the colleges with the traditional approach of 53.8% to RCC, 23.10 % to each of MVC and NC. DEMC may determine another method of apportioning FTES next year.
 - b. VC Brown discussed the FY 2015-16 RCCD Budget Plan to be presented at the April Board Committee. He commented that the plan is fluid and many things are not settled. Estimates of FTES are made at P1, P2, and finalized late in the year. FY 2014-15 base funded FTES was 25,648 and estimates at P1 were 27,643. Next estimate will be at P2. FY 2015-16 base FTES will be 26,920, and an FTES target/ceiling of 28,465. Much discussion ensued about what is happening at the State level with the growth formula and its implications for how we pursue “unfunded” FTES.
 - c. Problem Identification – Reiner discussed the problem he was charged to address: “Spending substantially more for part-time instruction than budgeted, which results in an annual deficit, which hurts our ability to fund other needs”— The Chancellor directed him to work on Enrollment Management and Strategic Planning.
 - i. Unfunded as “cushion”- 2010 Enrollment Task Force report discussed problems in the past with excessive “unfunded” and the need to reduce it for financial viability. The question is how much unfunded can we afford? Unfunded provides a “cushion” to ensure we exceed the State funded base, as falling below that level results in problems.
 - ii. Chasing FTES “left on the table”- Given that some districts can’t make their numbers, it is possible in some years to increase funding by exceeding our own targets. However, this entails risk and a determination must be made as to our “risk tolerance” level. Who makes that decision? As fall enrollment trends are the best predictor of spring enrollment, Reiner expressed concern that fall was down about 2%. It appeared we were trying to chase FTES in spring by offering more sections as colleges predicted increased demand. We were shooting above our targets in spring to hit the target, but it costs to run more sections.?
 - iii. Enrollment Management Task Force Report of May 2010 - Warned that we were not acting judiciously. When the State economy is improving, community colleges offer more sections; when the economy is bad, we cut back. This may be the opposite of what should be done to manage enrollment and serve students.

- iv. Countercyclical Nature of Apportionment Funding in CCC – The above report suggested that the economy and enrollment are countercyclical. Enrollment in California declines when the economy improves as people go back to work. When the economy is bad, people go back to the community college. A discussion ensued as to whether the Inland Empire is susceptible to this trend. Population is expected to continue to grow during the next decade. While enrollments were down in summer and fall, it's not from the countercyclical trend, but because students didn't know we had classes available. They had heard during the recession that RCC has no open spaces. Reiner commented that just because you build it, they may not come back. Students we turned away during the recession may have gone elsewhere. The proprietaries have extensive marketing and customer service. We just can't expect a return to how things were in the past. How do we judge student demand? Yes, the population is growing, but that doesn't mean they will come. Cost factors must also be considered in offering more sections/seats. Yes, we do need to provide access to students in need, but it must be data driven with a consideration of expenses.
- d. Consideration of Enrollment Management Model – Reiner reviewed enrollment data to date and “projections.” He explained that, from his perspective, the term “projection” may be a misnomer, as it is not based on an estimate of demand at P1, but begins at that point with the seat capacity colleges make available and is adjusted by historical data. However, he believes for spring we were shooting above the agreed upon targets by offering additional sections in order to hit the target. This approach, while it can result in “hitting the target” as you have been directed in the past, does not consider the other side of the coin; i.e., the cost of adding those sections. His analysis indicated that adding those sections in spring increased seat capacity beyond the current demand as summer and fall data indicated, and beyond the college targets which already contained the unfunded FTES to be used as a “cushion.” The additional sections increase part-time instructional spending by \$627,842, which adds to the deficit. Others argued that the demand is out there, so sections should be offered to increase access. Reiner discussed other ways of increasing FTES without adding sections: improving retention during the term, improving fall to spring retention, improving fill-rates, improving year-to-year persistence. Other issues discussed were the “need to tell the community we are open for business.” Get out advertising. State rewards us for growth. The only time we were burnt was the first 2 years of the recession. We need increased marketing, but where will the marketing money come from? We embraced the need for marketing efforts as a component of enrollment management. CTE and ADT faculty are concerned. Used to send out schedules. Students trying to come back with loans. College websites need work; they are the front marketing doors. Common template for college students. The tide has changed for marketing. Students are very technology-oriented and marketing can be cheaper with social media. Do we create a slogan? What needs to be marketed? What support can the District offer? Need to be very clear for short term and long term. Stop looking at one year at a time. It would help if colleges could plan for 2-year schedules. At the chair level, given the way we roll out the process, they have to do scheduling in only 10-15 days. The requirement to establish student educational plans to improve student success may help. We need to develop courses and schedules based on SEP plans. There are things we can do.
 - i. Chancellor's Cabinet - Discussed some of the above. They liked the idea of a range between the State base and our target. “Hitting the target” is not the only goal and colleges will not be penalized for being below their target. The goal is for the District collaboratively to be somewhere above the State base. How much above, “the cushion” of unfunded, is to be determined collectively. The Chancellor said DEMC will be the #1 committee next year.
 - ii. FTES & Budget – Need to discuss these together, not independently.
 - iii. DEMC next year— Trying to determine a new model will take at least a year, then a year to pilot and make adjustments.
 - iv. “Target” vs “Ceiling” & the “Sweet Zone”- Reiner presented a graphical representation of cumulative FTES over terms during FY 2014-15, differentiating State funded and our unfunded, which added together makes the “target.” He labeled the difference between

the two, currently about 3% - 4%, the “Sweet Zone.” Landing somewhere within the sweet zone by the end of the year, rather than hitting the target, may be a different way to approach enrollment management. As the sweet zone is currently “unfunded,” but may yield future funding depending upon the State’s growth formula and “FTES left on the table,” it involves a level of investment risk tolerance. Who determines what that should be? Reiner has discussed with the Chancellor’s Cabinet the idea of considering the “target” as a “ceiling” when we do scheduling. Perhaps that is the maximum of FTES we should aspire to and plan sections so as not to exceed that ceiling, as it already has “unfunded” cushion built into it. Plan to offer enough sections with that as the ceiling. The budget is built with that unfunded cushion, so trying to exceed it to grow FTES may be counterproductive. We have to ask, “How many sections can we afford to offer during the year? Do not have excess sections?” The complexities of enrollment management were discussed, as there are too many variables. Reiner noted that “Bang for the Buck” is going down. Fill rates are decreasing. Plan a schedule with a ceiling and how many sections you can afford to offer; if demand trends change, it should be a collective Cabinet decision as to how best to respond. District works collaboratively. For funding, the District has to meet certain metrics, as that will affect all of us. We are in one boat. This was followed by a discussion of the pros and cons of different programs for the colleges. Look at where we’ve been historically and then divide up growth. Use different numbers for efficiency. It is easy to divide FTES 20/20/60, but is that really serving students educational needs?

- v. Should we change our assumptions & the model? We need to think more about this and decide how to operate next year. Raj needs your term by term “targets/ceiling” for the year by the end of April. We need to spend money more effectively while serving students.

Enrollment management for the District and Colleges is key.

5. College Problem Identification—What are the issues for you, what enrollment data do you need? Talked about differential funding. Long term planning at the Colleges may be hindered by District practices. Rollover of the schedule does not provide sufficient time to plan effectively. Timeline of schedule development has to be reexamined. Using educational planning allows you to predict the 2-3 year schedule and the cost. A comment was made that we don’t have the right information for forecasting demand. Haven’t been asked to use it at a District level. External scan is outdated. Reexamine external scanning to be used for future trends. Marketing needs improving. There is more demand out there than the population thinks. We are not capturing a sufficient part of the market. We need to change our marketing to let them know we are here to serve. Need better communication. The daily enrollment headcounts has limited utility —love to see it tied to FTES data. Bottom line--colleges want to be successful.
6. Deadline 2015-16 College Targets per term - End of April to Raj.
7. Other-- See current allocation of part-time funding. Aaron said we are looking at it.
8. Adjournment – 10 a.m.

Next meeting is on April 30 at 8 a.m. at DO 307