MINUTES
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
December 5, 2017

X Adam Stoltz       X Daniel Parks*       X Jodi Shepherd
Allen Renville (Butte College)       X Diana Dwyre       X Judy Hennessey
X Baohui Song       Dylan Gray (AS Pres)       X Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee*
X Barbara Fortin       Farshad Azad       X Michael Rehg (Chair)
X Becca Chanes, Student Senator       X Jed Wyrick (Senate Chair)       X Rick Ford
X Ben Juliano       X Jeff Bell       X Theresa Cox*
Chris Souder       X Jeff Livingston
X Dan Reed       X Jennifer Meadows
X Jim Aird

In attendance:  * = Augmented Members (non-voting)  X = In attendance

Meeting convened at 3:15 p.m.

I. Approve Agenda (Michael Rehg)
   • Approved

II. Introductions and Announcements (Rehg)
   • None

III. Minutes from 11/7/17 (Rehg)
   • Approved

IV. Action Item from 10/3/17 meeting  (Daniel Parks)  CSU Chico Fully Online summary

   • Chico State’s participation in CSU fully online (AB 386) began in 2015:
     o AB 386 required state-supported fully online courses be available to students enrolled at other CSUs.
     o Differentiation from CSU CourseMatch: Program created by the CO in 2013. Courses developed by applying to the CO and gaining approval to offer specific online courses which have proven successful via the online format. We offered from three to six proven courses between 2014 and 2016 and currently offer none. The approval process is onerous and yielded low enrollment. CourseMatch enrollment is excluded from our annualized funded resident FTES target enrollment.

   • CSU fully online document provides overview of the program and processes and Chico State participation levels (i.e., 32 since 2015). There have been many issues to promoting these courses, such as late timing of campuses finalizing course listings, notifications to students, and uneven services to students across CSU campuses.

   • Analysis of a small sample of participating students indicated students fared worse when enrolled in online courses hosted at other CSU’s then other CSU students fared in online courses hosted at Chico State.

   • Regarding the budget model of fully online courses: Fully online course enrollments are included in annualized resident FTES funded targets. Students pay tuition to their home campus to gain access to the fully online courses at other campuses.

   • Office of the Registrar (REGS) hosts information on their Records and Registration website for CSU Fully Online, which includes link to the CSU Fully Online Course listing and the application, but hasn’t been actively promoting recently due to uneven success. Could consider promoting for spring 2018, with marketing in mid-January. Communicating support services available at other campuses is challenging.

   • Fortin is a member of the CSU GI 2025 Enrollment Management work group organized by the CO. CSU fully online will be a topic of discussion in spring 2018: Review CSU Fully online legislation and campus offerings/student enrollment; consider ways to improve offerings and enrollment; and CA community college online opportunities.
• An advantage of offering fully online courses: they can relieve bottleneck issues, in particular for general education courses.
• Currently six fully online courses are displayed for Chico State. How the course is setup determines if it is considered fully online.
• REGS coordinates our participation in CSU Fully Online and CourseMatch in collaboration with Bill Loker. If EMAC wants to discuss further, Loker could be invited to a spring semester meeting.

V. International Student Recruitment Plan: Continued Review (Rehg)

• Rehg waiting for response to EMAC sub-committee questions from Frank Li, Interim Vice President of International Education. There does not appear to be a plan for academic department buy in (e.g., which departments/programs are interested in receiving targeted recruitments of international students; which departments will be impacted).
• Rehg will follow up with Li. If no response, will consider how best to represent EMAC’s concerns about the draft plan with Academic Senate Executive Committee.

VI. Update from Statewide Academic Senate (Rick Ford)

• EO 1110 implementation: Math and English placement guidance was released in this memo from the CO on 9/29/17: Placement of Students Based on Their Academic Preparation. Additional implementation detail, in particular re: multiple measures/course placement, was released on 11/20/17: EO 1110 implementation guidance with attachments
• Ford reviewed the four placement categories:
  ○ Category 1 – Has fulfilled the GE Subarea A2 or B4 requirement
  ○ Category 2 – Placement in a GE Subarea A2 or B4 course
  ○ Category 3 – Recommend placement in a supported GE Subarea A2 or B4 course (and Early Start Program is recommended)
  ○ Category 4 – Required placement in a supported GE Subarea A2 or B4 course or the first term of an applicable stretch course (and Early Start Program is required—project Chico State will have 216 in this category). Students would take a GE science course in first semester then math in the second semester. This process differs by campus. Non-GE math courses count as electives but not toward graduation. We are not a campus that will offer non-GE math courses. It is unknown what defines a non-GE math course.
• CO intends to provide CMS (PeopleSoft) programing to support implementation.
• Other topics:
  ○ CA university admissions eligibility study for public high school class of 2015: Currently 40% of high school seniors are eligible for CSU enrollment; original CA master plan was for CSU’s to educate top one third.
  ○ Legislators are concerned about the 60,000 students turned away by the CSU who were eligible for enrollment. We need to do more for students who we cannot accommodate. This could potentially cause enrollment to increase across the system.
  ○ Processes for redirecting unaccommodated students to other CSU campuses will be developed as part of the Cal State Apply project.
  ○ 45% of high school seniors completed the college prep classes. National trends show more students pursuing college preparatory tracks. Faculty on Statewide Academic Senate have not expressed concern with the number of eligible students.
  ○ New CSU Board of Trustees Faculty Trustee is Romey Sabalius, Fresno State. He recently visited Chico State.
  ○ Next statewide meeting in January 2018.
VII. Enrollment Updates  

(Barbara Fortin, Adam Stoltz)

Enrollment Update

Butte College: No report as Renville was unable to attend.

Spring 2018
- Resident FTES is up 262/1.9%, likely due to students taking higher unit load.
- First fee payment deadline next week; second fee payment deadline 1/11/18.
- Add/drop opens 1/2/18 and unit caps are lifted. Wait-listing runs before students have access.
- New student estimate is 1,097. Stoltz reviewed estimated enrollment by major and college.

Fall 2018
- Stoltz reviewed Cal State Apply First-Time Freshman and Transfer application report for Chico State and other CSU campus. Exclusivity refers to students who have applied only to one campus; overall exclusivity is very low and trending down.
- 13,000 students applied to Chico State in the last three days of the application period, with 5,500 applying on the last day.
- Serving North State students continues to be a priority. Stoltz reviewed a recent North State Outreach Report.

2018-19 enrollment planning
- Campus has not received the 2018-19 funded enrollment target. Early CSU budget discussions suggest 0% enrollment growth, understanding this could change as final budgets are negotiated. Also await CO 2019-20 impaction guidance and report needs.
- Fall 2018 new undergraduate student estimates in the meantime: First-Time Freshman = 2,800 and Transfers = 1,600.

VIII. Sub-Committee Reports  

(Rehg)

Class Size and DFW Rates  

(Jeff Bell)
- Reference to Tenure Density information from 11/7 meeting: Graduation rates have gone up but tenure density has not. Little evidence of a correlation between tenure density and student success as measured by graduation rates or DFW rates. Colleges with the highest tenure density (e.g., HFA and ECC) don’t have better graduation rates than colleges with lower tenure density (e.g., CME and BSS). Tenure density increases tend to be paid for by increasing class size, so important to know how class size affects student success.
- Class size and DFW rates correlation: Data shows more students receive a failing grade in larger classes. This effect plateaus at a class size of about 50 in upper division classes, but the risk of failure keeps going up as class size increases in lower division classes. There is a higher discrepancy in upper division classes compared to lower division.
- Data reveals female students in general are less likely to fail a course; however minority females appear to be the most negatively affected by larger class sizes.
- Large class sizes in lower division courses show worse grades than large class sizes in upper division.
- Data indicates two classes of 60 students are better than one class of 120 students for student success.
- This data trend of higher failure rates in larger class sizes. The DFW rate is anomalously high for classes in the 31-40 range. This goes away when math classes are removed from the data set. This is due to the fact that most math classes cap enrollment at 30-35 students and they have much higher DFW rates than other classes that size.

IX. Other:
- None

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Theresa Cox, EMS AAS

X. Action Items:
• CSU Fully Online and CourseMatch: 1) Consider inviting Loker to attend a spring semester meeting to review courses, funding model, and success rates in more detail; 2) Parks will research fully online course setup and why we list only six courses for spring 2018 and consider promoting online course options for our students.
• Sub-committee reports for next meeting: 1) CA Promise; 2) EMAC EM 02-109.
• Next meeting: Tuesday, February 6, 3:15-4:45 pm, SSC 122/124.