

District Enrollment Management Committee

February 4, 2015

1 pm – 2 pm

District Office 343

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 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"/> C. Farrar, DOI (for Diane Dieckmeyer)	<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"/> R. Bajaj, Dean Ed Srvs, Inst. Reporting
RCCD Academic Senate	RCCD Faculty Association	Guest	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> T. Gibbs, President	<input type="checkbox"/> C. Rocco	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K. Fleming	

Dr. Reiner called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

1. Welcome & Announcements

- Chancellor needs recommended targets for FTES for 2015-16.
- Consider new model to allocate FTES to Colleges for 2016-2017.
- It is advantageous to balance FTES and efficiency so as to be cost-effective and not incur undue instructional expenses.

2. Minutes –May 30, 2014- Motion to Approve/MSD/Norm Godin/ Melissa Bader with 2 abstentions

3. Reports:

- Subcommittee of District Strategic Planning Committee (November, 2014)
 - Greater clarity is needed as to the reporting structure of EMC with the Chancellor, DSPC, District Senate, etc. At present, EMC will report its recommendations to the Chancellor and Cabinet for expediency and as an information item to DSPC and District Senate. In the future, alternatives can be considered.
- FTES Projections for 2015-16
 - Vice Chancellor Brown reported on current budget planning at the state-level and implications for RCCD. Presented budget/FTES targets with modeling based upon state funded and alternative unfunded projections. Much discussion ensued as to the numbers, size of the unfunded percentage, differences among the Colleges, implications for the District, national trends, regional and local exceptionalities, etc.
 - Reiner suggested using the model based on the “Old Funding Formula” and 4.5% unfunded.

4. Recommendation for District FTES Target, 2015-16

- Motion to set District Target at 28,465.64 and to reconsider should the new growth formula be implemented. Motion to Approve/MSD/Tonya Parker/Travis Gibbs. All in favor.

5. Recommendation for College FTES Targets, 2015-16

- Motion to set College Targets at 53.8% to RCC, 23.10 % for MV and NC. Discussion ensued concerning the needs of the Colleges and whether the traditional distribution of FTES provides adequate funding. Many issues were considered. Reiner requested that, given the immediate need of Colleges to plan for 2015-16, changes to the traditional method should be deferred until a new funding model is considered. Motion to Approve/MSD/Carol Farrar/Susan Mills. Motion carried with 1 opposed.

6. Progress toward 2014-15 Targets and Spring Enrollments

- Data was reviewed. Both Summer and Fall had a 2% decline from the targets overall for the District. Winter, however, was substantially up, about 18%.
- Reiner expressed concern that the national trend is for an enrollment decline, as community college enrollments historically decrease as the economy improves. Therefore, given the fall enrollment

decline, he had concerns about projections to exceed spring targets. Others explained that Colleges must divide their annual target by semesters, and that these estimates have a margin of error. In addition, national trends may not apply here, as we are recovering from substantial cuts in capacity during the recession and that regional demographics provide exceptionalities to national trends.

- Colleges felt comfortable that they will exceed their annual targets and with their increased “Projected” for Spring.

7. Capacity, Efficiency, & Budgetary Implications, 2014-15

- Enrollment management is a double edged sword. You want to provide sufficient capacity to meet the demand, but do so in a way that is efficient so as not to incur undo instructional costs.
- Colleges know their situations best and were asked to keep an eye on both sides of this coin.
- Reiner expressed the view that he is loathed to cut sections at the last minute due to low enrollment because it is unfair to students, especially those who registered early or need those particular sections. However, to avoid cutting sections requires good enrollment management. He discussed a philosophy called “The Guaranteed Schedule,” but acknowledged it was based on an approach to funding different from California’s method.

8. Enrollment Management Model for 2016-17.

- Enrollment Management Committee will meet regularly to consider new approaches and models.
 - Strategic plans for District and Colleges establish priorities.
 - Implications of these plans follow for Instruction/Student Services/Etc.
 - Resource allocation should be done to achieve strategic plan objectives - How do we divide the pie to accomplish College and District goals?

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.