

# MINUTES

## ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

October 28, 2014

### In attendance:

X	Bill Allen	X	Judith Hennessey	X	Michael Rehg
X	Allan Bee	X	Taylor Herren (AS President)	X	Allen Renville (Butte College)*
X	Kim DuFour*	X	Jean Irving*	X	Paula Selvester (Senate Chair)
X	Diana Dwyre ( <i>vice chair</i> )	X	Kathleen Kaiser	X	Baohui Song
X	Rick Ford ( <i>chair</i> )	X	Jeff Livingston	X	Chris Souder
X	Barbara Fortin	X	Jennifer Meadows	X	James Tyler
X	Lori Fuentes		Dan Reed	X	Jessica Verardi

\* = Augmented Members

X = In attendance

Meeting convened at 3:15 p.m.

### Approval of Agenda (Ford)

- No changes

### Introductions and Announcements (Ford)

- Chico Preview Day was held Oct. 25. Allan Bee thanked Taylor Herren for speaking at the event. In spite of the rain, the event was a big success. Over 1600 registered and over 1300 attended. Bee thanked everyone who assisted and gave up their Saturday to be there.
- Kaiser asked if it is necessary to send someone with a proxy if members are unable to attend an EMAC meeting. Ford indicated votes were rare; probably not necessary.

### Approval of Minutes from 9/23/2014 Meeting (Ford)

- Passed and approved

### Action Items from 9-23-14 EMAC Meeting (Ford and Fortin)

#### Penalty for Missing 2014-15 FTES Target

- At the last University Budget Committee (UBC) meeting, the President alluded to there being no penalty for being over-target.
- Chico State will likely be 2.55% over target for 2014-15, whereas some CSU campuses are over by up to 16%.

#### Excess Fee Distribution

- Lori Hoffman indicated at UBC that the extra fees generated through international and resident enrollment above the resident FTES target are distributed using the same allocation model as the general fund allocation. The distribution for 2014-15 is VPAA 72%, B&F 16%, Advancement 3% and VPSA 9%. The president's office receives less than 1%.
- At Butte College, the additional fee income generated by international students is distributed to the areas most impacted (majors, support services). Kaiser indicated it is a slippery slope because that kind of distribution (same as general fund) could be taken as an indication that international students can be supported at the same cost as in-state students. Faculty would argue that allocation model doesn't work.
- Should EMAC obtain additional information to determine a better allocation model?

#### Minutes

- On track to get the minutes out electronically a week early.

**Butte College Enrollment Update – Renville***Email attachments*

- For fall 2014, 1.5% over based upon same time frame as last year.
- Plan is to be 2.75% over target for 2014-15.
- Started the winter/spring campaign. Haven't really invested funding in recruitment before; definitely need to this year to help hit Butte's target.
- Recognizes the mismatch between Chico and Butte's start/end dates for winter session. Butte has scheduled quite a few evening courses that may alleviate the issue. Acknowledged it was Butte's error and they will be more cognizant of Chico State's academic calendar in the future.
- Butte's enrollment marketing is using more social media than ever. Facebook and Google drawing a lot of students.
- Butte's Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) totals are going up. Will email a complete list to EMAC members. Currently have 24 associate degrees now.
- Kaiser asked how community colleges are validating a student did a TMC? The protocol is to survey students who have recently completed the program to verify the units before communicating to admissions/records who then communicates the data to the receiving college. Convolved process. Numbers don't seem to match up. There is a new CSU web site (CaliforniaColleges.edu) for community colleges for information on students who are intentionally completing an ADT. The hope is the site will simplify, improve, and streamline the process. Still lots of clean up to do before it goes live spring 2015.
- Impacted campuses forced to give a GPA bump for ADT applicants (e.g. Chico State - .2 GPA points). Campuses want to know their efforts are working. Pushing hard to get some type of verifiable results.
- Per Irving and Bee: GPA bump is used minimally per discussion at CSU Directors of Admissions and Records (DAR) meeting last week.
- CSU sees process as improving throughput.
- 72 new transfer students through ADT program for fall 2014. Tracked in DGAP and required to complete certain steps. DuFour will provide detail on majors at next EMAC meeting.
- Renville feels ADT numbers will pick up once students understand the advantage of an ADT.
- From ICC minutes per Kaiser: SB 1440 has been a major focus, great collaboration; working to get campuses to adopt/offer the degrees; 1500 AT degrees in place; these degrees are becoming the default means of transfer; need to get students to follow the pathways; 700 students first year, 5500 next year, 11,000 more recently; would like to work with UCs and Independents to adopt.

**Fall 2014 Enrollment Census– Fortin***Handout*

- Census Headcount and New Student charts changed minimally since September meeting.
- Total new students came in about 500 above targets.
- For 2014-15, we are expecting to be about 2.55% over our Resident FTES target. Estimating 500 new resident students for spring 2015.
- While we are limiting spring upper division transfers, given we opened for spring, we need to accommodate qualified service area students and ADTs.
- Chico State will not be accommodating out-of-area transfer students.
- Across the CSU, most campuses were closed for new students in spring.
- Considerable discussion on CourseMatch:
  - CourseMatch applications/admissions/enrollment involves manual tracking and processing (labor intensive).
  - There has not been any notification to students for spring 2015 CourseMatch courses per Herren.
  - CMS is providing a CourseMatch modification next week that needs to be tested for spring 2015.
  - Chancellor's Office did not let Chico State know CourseMatch courses for fall 2014 were approved until July.
  - AB 386 will make every CSU fully online course (about 3000) available to all CSU students.
  - Education has online courses that could be problematic because of the in-class issue with children. It is a required course to enroll in the credential problem for elementary and secondary teaching.

- Two years into it and faculty are still unaware. Faculty and advisers need to be educated on CourseMatch and AB 386. Courses should have prerequisites that are set to prevent issues like those in Education from happening. Chairs Council would be a great place to start the education process – Irving will look into attending.
- What is fully online for fall 2015?
- Rehg – what priority do off-campus CSU students get?
- Do chairs need to increase enrollment in popular courses or open new sections? What about wait lists?
- AB 386 process is will be automated for selecting, applying, and enrolling in courses at different campuses.
- Will students be added to wait lists or will they only see courses with “available” seating?
- Do our students have assurance courses they take at another campus will be accepted by our campus (business, etc.)? Irving indicated articulation should be completed before the system goes live.
- If local courses have room, students can still go and take a course at another campus.
- CourseMatch and AB 386 funding is different. Need to find out details.
- Departments can add “instructor permission” to courses to control enrollment. Faculty would then have to deal with every student.
- Selvester indicated concern about whether we are really serving the North State. Are we sure we are not allowing out-of-area students to fill up these courses?
- Departments need to be aware of resource needs before AB 386 goes into effect.

#### **Spring 2015 Enrollment Update– Bee**

- For spring 2015, we our target is 500 resident students; 400 undergraduate and 100 credential/graduate. As of 10/27/2014, Chico State had admitted 768 students; 548 domestic. These figures put us close to being done admitting students.
- Ford suggested preparing a statement from EMAC regarding the excess number of students when the campus is already over target and reducing the number we admit in spring. Kaiser pointed out that when the CSU restricted access in the past, it did not work out well because demand built up a lot of pressure and campuses were then drowning in transfer requests.
- ADT deadline was extended to Nov. 7 to allow community college students to submit verifications.
- Admissions working on reinstatements.
- 170 undergraduate students submitted intent-to-enrolls. Should be able to meet the 400 cap.
- Will be turning away a considerable number of non-service area transfer applicants.
- Accepting special population transfers (Foster Youth, Veterans, etc.)
- Most of the graduate applicants are credential students – working on bringing in 70 (2 cohorts).
- Waiting for a list of the 40 nursing students who will be admitted in spring showing whether they are new transfers or second baccs.
- Invite Frank Li to next EMAC meeting for discussion on international students and results from student work group.

#### **2014-15 Enrollment Planning- Ford and Fortin**

- As previously noted, estimating we will be 2.55% over the resident FTES target of 14, 563.

#### **Fall 2015 Admission Application Processing Update- Bee**

#### **Attachment**

- Overall, CSU system is trending down in admissions applications. Southern CSU campus declines are steeper than Chico State. (*see attachment*)
- Half-way through fall priority application period.
- Processing freshmen applications. Admitting service area applicants at a 2900 index and out-of-service area at a 3502 index. 1,963 have been admitted. 10 have submitted Intent-to-Enrolls. The deadline is May 1, 2015.

#### **2015-16 Enrollment Planning- Ford and Fortin**

- If we are going to be over target for 2014-15, is it possible to consider very limited growth?
- We have not heard from the CO regarding a target. Hoping to hear soon.

- The President indicated he may consider moderating our target based on being over for 2014-15. Total growth should be about 3.94% for 2014-15.
- Managing down next year would be appropriate if we are looking at a 2.3% growth over 2-years.
- Kaiser indicated the California Admission Advisory will suggest the CSU could politically dial down enrollment. Our reason would be the constraint of our campus (location, capacity, etc.)
- The Chancellor needs to know that even though we are managing more students, we are not managing it well. Quality has suffered significantly. It is time to return to a slow-growth policy and work on rebuilding resources (specifically faculty and staff). Programs have courses with students but no qualified faculty to teach them.
- Tenure-track instructional faculty (no FERPs, leaves, or rehired annuitant) fall only numbers dropped from 408, to 390, to 380, to 361 and then to 355 between 2010-2014. Faculty numbers keep decreasing while student numbers increased. There is a valid argument in restraining enrollment growth. Should there be a discussion regarding a 2- or 3-year growth model which might allow us to manage down if needed.
- Physical capacity of our campus is 18,000 per the master plan after the new physical sciences, Modoc II, and other buildings are completed.
- Bill Allen prepared a schedule capacity report showing FTES generated by all classes based on caps. Compares to total FTES. Hard to track how many courses are over-enrolled because the caps get changed as faculty agree to teach more students in each session.
- There were only 6% of open sections in GE left as of 9/15/14.
- Enrollment should not continue to go up without resources going up as well. And resources are already behind—needs to happen now. Our campus is as lean as we can be.
- AB 386 will make it hard to measure how over taxed faculty will be.
- Consider preparing a five-year snapshot showing tenure-track faculty net beside the growth in enrollment. Easier to make the case that we are undermining the academic reputation of Chico State and not producing the same quality of students. Temporary faculty cannot build programs.
- Achievement gap refers to students who enter but do not graduate. The resource gap is when students enter but do not have qualified faculty to teach them.
- Faculty density needs to be discussed. Invite Wenshu Lee to EMAC to discuss who set the density goal at 70%.
- Need to formalize the resolution Meadow's work group prepare, along with additional data, to point out the failure of the campus to properly address the resource issue. Meadows will assist Ford in accomplishing this before the next EMAC meeting. It will need to be shared with Academic Senate for public endorsement.

### **CSU Admissions Advisory Council Announcements (Kaiser)**

While 42 states are trying to set college readiness (benchmarked for entire nation), California has two underway. ACT and SAT have gotten into the game quicker than anyone else and are creating a benchmark exam. ACT is first out of the gate. SAT has given us a confidence that they will benchmark to a score. Senior year has traditionally been used as a catch up year when students are rusty on a topic (English, math). Early Start has gotten more intense. Trying to reach juniors to tell them they need to take the ACT or the SAT NOW to give us a test score we can trust. That is critical. Students can repeat the test 3 times and incentives are provided.

ADDED PER EMAIL FROM KAISER

Attached is the report I brought to our meeting on Tuesday but didn't get the chance to do more than make references to it. You will see in the section for the CCC that they are very focused on the success of SB 1440. But I think it is helpful for us to see what the 'official' overview that is being presented by all of the higher education sections. If you also focus on sexual assault and the Clery Report (misspelled in this report) and teacher prep, you will note that the transfer number that supposedly represents TMC-AA/AS doesn't really do so—they only represent students who transferred from the CCC to the CSU. This is another aspect that is probably an immediate issue for the CSU and our local CCC region. Shasta wants to argue that IF the only access point to a particular degree (4-yr) program is in SDSU—is that far enough away that under the experimental 4-yr degree pilot under SB850, could they offer that degree? (I don't yet know which degree Shasta is suggesting?) The other item is that all of the segments are noting —multiple plans to increase 'access' to a college degree or certificate WITHOUT funding—is only creating a greater backlog and pent up demand and disappointment. This might help anchor the resolution that Jennifer and Rick were going to work on.

**Action Items:**

1. Should EMAC obtain additional information to determine a better allocation model for excess fees?
2. DuFour will provide detail on ADT majors at next EMAC meeting.
3. Irving will look into attending a Chairs Council meeting to discuss AB 386 and CourseMatch.
4. What is fully online for fall 2015? (AB 386)
5. Will students be added to CourseMatch/AB 386 wait lists or will they only see courses with “available” seating?
6. CourseMatch and AB 386 funding is different. Need to find out details. Irving will look into.
7. Selvester indicated concern about whether out-of-area students will fill up online courses before service area student can enroll. Is there any mechanism for ensuring this does not occur?
8. Invite Frank Li to next EMAC meeting for discussion on international students and discuss results from international student work group, along with additional data, to point out the failure of the campus to properly address the resource issue. Meadows will assist Ford in accomplishing this before the next EMAC meeting. It will need to be shared with Academic Senate for public endorsement.
9. Invite Wenshu Lee to EMAC to discuss the faculty density goal of 70%.